00088034

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from
Ms.Vaidehi Thakar
on 06 November, 2019

لِلّٰهِ كُنُوزٌ تَحْتَ ٱلْعَرْشِ مَفَاتِيحُهَا أَلْسِنَةُ ٱلشُّعَرَاءِ

'God hath Treasuries aneath the Throne, the Keys whereof are the Tongues of the Poets.'

Hadís-i Sheríf.

A

HISTORY

OF

OTTOMAN POETRY

BY

E. J. W. GIBB, M.R.A.S.

88034
ac

VOLUME I

Exa-C-9

LONDON
LUZAC & CO., GREAT RUSSELL STREET
1900

OP
894.351C7
Gib/His
88034

Sc9.1196

00088034

PRINTED BY E. J. BRILL. LEYDEN.

PREFACE.

The History of Ottoman Literature has yet to be written. So far no serious work has been published, whether in Turkish or in any foreign language, that attempts to give a comprehensive view of the whole field. Such books as have appeared up till now deal, like the present, with one side only, namely, Poetry. The reason why Ottoman prose has been thus neglected lies probably in the fact that until within the last half-century nearly all Turkish writing that was wholly or mainly literary or artistic in intention took the form of verse. Prose was as a rule reserved for practical and utilitarian purposes. Moreover, those few prose works that were artistic in aim, such as the Humáyún-Náme and the later Khamsa-i Nergisí, were invariably elaborated upon the lines that at the time prevailed in poetry. Such works were of course not in metre; but this apart, their authors sought the same ends as did the poets, and sought to attain these by the same means. The merits and demerits of such writings therefore are practically the same as those of the contemporary poetry. The History of Ottoman Poetry is thus nearly equivalent to the History of Ottoman Literature. All the same, an account of the work done by the Ottomans in prose ought to be available; and to supply such an account is among the hopes of the present writer.

Within recent years there have appeared in Turkish a few monographs dealing with individual poets, also some

newspaper and magazine articles which survey briefly and without detail the whole field of literature. These, though often valuable and suggestive, are of necessity quite inadequate. The only serious attempt yet made at the systematic study of any branch of this literature is that made more than half a century ago by Baron von Hammer-Purgstall in his well-known 'History of the Ottoman Poetic Art.' [1] But the monumental work so called hardly answers to its name; it is less a history of Ottoman poetry than a dictionary of Ottoman poets. There exist in Turkish a number of works called Tezkires, that is, 'Memoirs of the Poets,' which give the lives of poets who flourished at certain periods, together with specimens of their work. Von Hammer's great book is not much more than a translation of these Tezkires, with the entries arranged in approximate chronological order. He makes but little attempt to trace the development of the poetry, to point out the various forces by which it has been affected, or to distinguish the relative positions of even the greatest poets, whether as regards the merit of their actual achievement, the nature of their indebtedness to their predecessors, or the measure of the influence they exerted over their contemporaries and successors.

The work therefore can scarcely be correctly described as a History. None the less, notwithstanding numerous errors, many of them almost inevitable in a first attempt, it is of the greatest value as a book of reference. If evidence of the critical faculty be somewhat to seek, we find on the other hand almost every detail that can be gleaned from the Tezkires and other Turkish authorities. Every poet, every versifier, of whom Von Hammer could find any mention, however slight, is entered in his pages. Thus although the last of

[1] 'Geschichte der Osmanischen Dichtkunst,' by Hammer-Purgstall, 4 vols., Pesth, 1836-8.

his four volumes was published as long ago as 1838, he has two thousand two hundred entries, each dealing with a different poet.[1] His book is therefore likely to remain for many a year to come, what it has been since the day of its publication, the sheet-anchor of all whose pursuits lead them to the study of Ottoman literature.

In the present work no attempt is made to rival Von Hammer; my object is to supplement his labours, not to supersede them. In order to do the latter, not a History of Ottoman Poetry, but a more accurate and more complete Biographical Dictionary of the Ottoman Poets, would be required. The student who possesses this work will not be able to dispense with Von Hammer's; of the latter's two thousand two hundred poets, probably barely a tenth will appear in these pages. My object is rather to bring into prominence that aspect of the subject which has been left comparatively unnoticed by my talented and industrious precursor; I have endeavoured to trace the successive phases through which Ottoman poetry has passed, to discover the influences which have brought these about, and in this way to present as it were a panorama of the rise and progress of this poetry.

My chief purpose, however, in writing this book is not to supply Orientalists with a sketch of the development of Ottoman poetry, but to place within reach of English readers some account of a literature which has as yet been hardly touched upon by any writer in our language. Concerning the Arabic and Persian literatures a certain amount is now known; but regarding that of Turkey there is still blank ignorance, an ignorance which not unfrequently leads to the somewhat inconsequent conclusion that 'the Turks have no

[1] In a very few instances the same poet has been entered more than once, owing to some confusion in the authorities.

literature.' As it is my hope and my endeavour to do something towards removing this ignorance, I have addressed myself in the first place to the average English reader who is wholly innocent of any Oriental learning. I have therefore explained many things, in the notes and elsewhere, which, had I been writing exclusively for scholars, I should have left unnoticed, as being perfectly familiar to everyone interested in any Muhammedan literature.

Of the many difficulties which beset the path of one who undertakes a work like the present, not the least is that of procuring the necessary materials. These for the most part still remain in manuscript; and to get together all the books it would be desirable to have, is a practically impossible task. And so, although after several years of search I have succeeded in forming a collection which, when supplemented by the volumes bearing on the subject preserved in the British Museum, has placed within my reach nearly all the more necessary of such books, there still remains a number which I have been unable to consult, and access to which would have allowed me to make my work somewhat more complete.

The scheme of this History is in Six Books, the first of which is Introductory, while each of the others deals with one of the Five Periods into which I have divided the story of Ottoman poetry. Of these Six Books, the First and Second are contained in the present Volume. [1]

In order to assist the reader in realising, so far as this is possible without a knowledge of the language, what Ottoman

[1] A list of the works consulted in the preparation of the History, together with indices to the notes, etc., will be printed in the final volume.

On the completion of the History I hope to issue a supplementary volume containing the texts of all the poems translated in the work. In the meantime the first line of the text of every translated passage will be found in an Appendix to the volume in which the translation occurs.

poetry is actually like, I have in most cases supplemented the account of a poet's works by one or more translated extracts. The end I had in view would not have been attained by a prose translation, or even by a versified rendering of the usual sort from which every trace of the external form of the original has vanished. That end was to be attained only by a translation in which this form should be reproduced. Moreover, such reproduction is, in my opinion, one of the essentials of a satisfactory translation. As the late Mr. J. A. Symonds most truly says, 'a good translation should resemble a plaster-cast, the English being *plaqué* upon the original, so as to reproduce its exact form, although it cannot convey the effects of bronze or marble which belong to the material of the work of art.' [1] The principle thus laid down is practically the same as that enunciated and observed with signal success by Mr. John Payne in his admirable and scholarly translations of The Thousand and One Nights and the Quatrains of ᶜOmar-i Khayyám. Applied to the translation of Oriental poetry, it involves the preservation of the exterior form of the verse by following the movement of the rhyme, retaining, when possible, the identity in number of the syllables in each line, and suggesting the rhythm by the fall of the accent. These then are the practical rules by which I have been guided so far as the form of the translations is concerned. But while I have been thus respectful of the external structure, I have not allowed my care for this to prejudice the sense of the poem. I have throughout striven to be as literal as possible, omitting nothing of importance, and carefully guarding against the introduction of metaphors or similes for which the original gives no warrant. In this way I hope to have succeeded in presenting in these trans-

[1] 'Wine, Women, and Song,' p. 38.

lations a series of photographs of Ottoman poetry, and it is only as such that I offer them to the reader's notice.

The critic who seeks to appraise the literary works of a foreign people will do well to bear in mind his own inevitable limitations. However learned he may be, and however scholarly the knowledge he may possess of the language in question, he must yet in some respects stand at a disadvantage beside the native school-child. A word or a phrase often suggests, over and above its dictionary-meaning, a world of associations instinctively perceived by every native, but which for the foreigner have no existence. And it is not unfrequently in the happy employment of such suggestive word or phrase that the chief merit of a literary passage lies. But while points such as this, or more subtle still, constitute something of the charm of literature in all languages, and should, if duly considered, tend everywhere to give the foreign critic pause, Ottoman poetry, owing to the extreme artificiality which characterised it till within the last few decades, contains a far less proportion than is usual of this intimate quality. For this poetry is so hedged in on every side by hard and fast rules, that there would almost seem to have been a deliberate conspiracy to block every avenue against spontaneity and individuality. The success of a poet was held to be determined in no small measure by the skill he displayed in dancing among many glasses without overturning any one of them. And here at any rate the foreign critic stands on an equal footing with the Ottoman. The rules of the game can be learned equally well by anyone, Turk or foreigner, who chooses to take the necessary trouble; and once they are mastered, it is easy enough to see whether they have been observed.

Still this is only one side of the matter; there is another and far more vital: did those poets, with all their verbal

jugglery and intellectual gymnastic, give true and adequate expression to the spirit of their world? The answer to this question is the verdict of their success or failure. And surely those for whom they wrote, those who lived in the same world and breathed the same moral and intellectual atmosphere, are the best qualified to give this answer. I have therefore, whenever these have been obtainable, given prominence to the opinions of the Ottoman critics on the Ottoman poets, more especially when poet and critic have been contemporary or nearly so. At the same time I have not refrained from expressing my own views, even when these are at variance with the opinions of the Turkish authorities. In such cases the reader must not take my conclusions as advanced with any pretension to finality; they are presented, as indeed are all the critical observations I have ventured to make, simply as the impressions of a foreign student who has tried to understand the works of the Ottoman poets and to enter into sympathy with them.

It remains for me gratefully to acknowledge the assistance I have received in my work. I here tender my sincere thanks to all who have in any way helped me, more especially to my friends Cherkesh-Sheykhi-záde Khalíl Khálid Efendi and Professor Muhammed Barakat-ulláh, the latter of whom has with the utmost kindness placed at my disposal the stores of his great erudition.

E. J. W. GIBB.

15, Chepstow Villas, London, W.
May, 1900.

ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF THE OTTOMAN NAMES AND WORDS.

As the present work is addressed in the first place to the general reader, no attempt has been made, when transliterating Oriental names and words, to distinguish between the several homophonous letters of the Ottoman alphabet. A definite system of transliteration has, however, been observed; and attention to the following remarks will ensure an approximately correct pronunciation.

The Ottoman vowel-system is highly elaborate; but here it will be sufficient to note: —

a is to be pronounced as a in 'far,' but rather shorter.

e „ „ „ „ „ e in 'met.' (e at the end of a word must always be fully sounded: thus náme, záde, tezkire, are to be pronounced as if written ná-meh, zá-deh, tez-ki-ṛeh.)

i „ „ „ „ „ i in 'pin.' (In some cases it is pronounced as i in 'bird;' this has not been distinguished in the transliteration. When i occurs in a syllable preceded by one containing o or u, it is pronounced as u: thus the name of the town Boli is pronounced Bolu.)

o „ „ „ „ „ o in 'so.'

u „ „ „ „ „ u in 'rule.' (In many cases it is pronounced like the French u in 'tu' or 'du;' this has not been distinguished. Occasionally it is sounded like the French eu in 'deux,' or the German ö. In the more important cases this last pronunciation has been represented by ö in the transliteration.)

á, í, ú, occur only in Arabic or Persian words; in these languages they stand for the long sounds corresponding to the short a, i, u: in

Turkish there are properly no long vowels, but the presence of á, í or ú causes the syllable in which it occurs to receive a stress or accent. í has generally the sound of i in 'machine.'

ay is to be pronounced as ay in 'ay' or 'aye' meaning 'yes,' i. e. as 'I.'

ey " " " " " ey in 'they.'

The consonants are to be pronounced as in English, subject to the following notes: —

ch as ch in 'church.'

g is always hard as in 'get,' 'give,' never soft as in 'gem,' 'gin.' (When g is followed by á, a slight y sound is introduced between them, just as when a Cockney says 'gyarden' instead of 'garden:' thus the name Nigár is pronounced as if written Nigyár. When g follows a vowel it has a tendency to melt away into a y; thus the title written Beg is pronounced Bey.)

gh is pronounced as ğh in 'ghastly' or 'ghost.' (When gh follows a vowel it has a tendency to melt away into a sort of w, much as in our words 'through' and 'throughout:' thus oghli is pronounced like ō-lu.)

h must always be fully pronounced whether it occurs at the beginning, in the middle or at the end of a word.

k (When k is followed by á, a slight y sound is introduced between them, exactly as in the case of g and á: thus the word Kátib is pronounced Kyátib.)

kh had originally the sound of ch in the Scotch 'loch' or the German 'Nacht;' but nowadays it is pronounced like a simple h: thus khan, khanim, Sheykhí, táríkh, are pronounced as though written han, hanim, Sheyhí, tárih.

ñ had formerly a nasal sound, but is now generally pronounced as a simple n.

q is pronounced exactly like k: thus qasída, Báqí, ᶜAshiq, are pronounced as if written kasída, Bákí, ᶜAshik.

s is always sharp as in 'mouse,' never flat as in 'reason.'

sh is the English sh in 'shall,' 'rash,' and so on.

ᶜ represents the Arabic letter ᶜAyn; in Turkish, when this occurs in the middle of a word, its presence is indicated by a slight hiatus or catch in the breath; when it occurs at the beginning of a word, it is entirely ignored in pronunciation: thus Refíᶜí and ᶜAshiq are pronounced Refí-í and Ashik.

ᵓ indicates that a letter is omitted; when this occurs between two vowels,

it also has the value of a slight hiatus, as in the name ʿAtáʾí pronounced Atá-í.

When a letter is doubled in writing it is also doubled in pronouncing; thus the word mukhammes is pronounced mu-ham-mes, each m receiving its value, as in our compound, 'home-made.'

Accentuation is less strongly marked than in English; but as a general rule the last syllable of a word receives a certain stress, and this even if the word contain one of the Arabic or Persian long vowels á, í or ú: thus ghazel is pronounced as gha-zèl rather than as ghà-zel; and the last syllable of qasída takes a slight accent, qa-sí-dà, notwithstanding the presence of the í in the middle syllable.

In the case of Oriental words that have become naturalised in English, the ordinary spelling has been retained when this adequately represents the pronunciation. Of such words are Islam, Koran, Houri, Sultan, Bey, Cadi, and Dervish, which according to the system would be written Islám, Qurʾán, Húrí, Sultán, Beg, Qádí (for Qází), Dervísh. On the other hand Vezir (for Vezír) has been used instead of the barbarous Vizier, Khalífa instead of Caliph, Muslim instead of Moslem.

In the same way, with regard to geographical names: forms that have become established by usage, such as Aleppo, Cairo, Baghdad, Crimea, have been employed instead of their originals, Haleb, Qáhira, Baghdád, Qirim; in the case of Greek and other European names modified by the Turks, the original form has been retained when this is the more familiar, thus, Adrianople, Smyrna, Bosnia, for Edirne, Izmir, Bosna; otherwise the Turkish modification has been used, thus, Qonya, Iznik, Izmid, for Iconium, Nicæa, Nicomedia.

LIST OF THE OTTOMAN SULTANS.

ʿOsmán I succeeded his father Er-Toghrul, son of Suleymán Sháh, as chief of his tribe in A. H. 687 (A. D. 1288); he became an independent sovereign on the dissolution of the Seljúq Empire in A. H. 699 (A. D. 1299).

The dates are those of the Sovereign's accession, according to the Muhammedan and Christian eras.

			A. H.	A. D.
1	ʿOsmán I	son of Er-Toghrul	699	1299
2	Orkhan	son of ʿOsmán I	726	1326
3	Murád I	son of Orkhan	761	1359
4	Báyezíd I	son of Murád I	792	1390
	Interregnum (The Princes Suleymán, ʿIsa, Músa, and Mehemmed, sons of Báyezíd I, fight for the throne.)		805	1493
5	Mehemmed I	son of Báyezíd I	816	1413
6	Murád II	son of Mehemmed I	824	1421
7	Mehemmed II	son of Murád II	855	1451
8	Báyezíd II	son of Mehemmed II	886	1481
9	Selím	son of Báyezíd II	918	1512
10	Suleymán I	son of Selím I	926	1520
11	Selím II	son of Suleymán I	974	1566
12	Murád III	son of Selím II	982	1574
13	Mehemmed III	son of Murád III	1003	1595
14	Ahmed I	son of Mehemmed III	1012	1603
15	Mustafà I	son of Mehemmed III	1026	1617
16	ʿOsmán II	son of Ahmed I	1027	1618
	Mustafà I	(restored)	1031	1622
17	Murád IV	son of Ahmed I	1032	1623
18	Ibráhím	son of Ahmed I	1049	1640
19	Mehemmed IV	son of Ibráhím	1058	1648
20	Suleymán II	son of Ibráhím	1099	1687

			A. H.	A. D.
21	Ahmed II	son of Ibráhím	1102	1691
22	Mustafà II	son of Mehemmed IV	1106	1695
23	Ahmed III	son of Mehemmed IV	1115	1703
24	Mahmúd I	son of Mustafà II	1143	1730
25	ᶜOsmán III	son of Mustafà II	1168	1754
26	Mustafà III	son of Ahmed III	1171	1757
27	ᶜAbd-ul-Hamíd I	son of Ahmed III	1187	1773
28	Selím III	son of Mustafà III	1203	1789
29	Mustafà IV	son of ᶜAbd-ul-Hamíd I	1222	1807
30	Mahmúd II	son of ᶜAbd-ul-Hamíd I	1223	1808
31	ᶜAbd-ul-Mejíd	son of Mahmúd II	1255	1839
32	ᶜAbd-ul-ᶜAzíz	son of Mahmúd II	1277	1861
33	Murád V	son of ᶜAbd-ul-Mejíd	1293	1876
34	ᶜAbd-ul-Hamíd II	son of ᶜAbd-ul-Mejíd	1293	1876

CORRIGENDA.

Page	Line	For:	Read:
17	14	لاعرفا	لاعرف
20	12	it the cause	it is the cause
25	5	eek	seek
35	17	n	iñ
45	2	càrry	carry
50	6	Mushterik	Mushterek
100	11	Subhet	Subhat
106	16	n	in
116	29	حکنت	حکمت
120	30	o	of
152	20	Jélal-ud-Dín	Jelál-ud-Dín
218	33	ٱلْكَرِيم	ٱلْكَرِيمِ
221	24	resent	present
231	3	Riyázi	Riyází
241	26	أَبْتَر	أَبْتَرُ
242	27	شَبأً	شَيْءٌ
286	4	Záhír	Zahír
293	31	calander	calender
302	27	Khirad-Náme	Khired-Náme
359	3	amything	anything
370	33	فَانّا	آنَا
408	17	سَوَاهُ	سِوَاهُ
432	12	frustate	frustrate.

CONTENTS OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

Page

Preface v

On the Pronunciation of the Ottoman Names and Words xiii

List of the Ottoman Sultans xvii

Corrigenda. xix

BOOK I: INTRODUCTORY —

Chapter I: The Origin, Character and Scope of Ottoman Poetry . . 3

Chapter II: Tradition, Philosophy and Mysticism 33

Chapter III: Verse-Forms, Prosody and Rhetoric 70

Chapter IV: Historical Outline 125

BOOK II: THE FIRST PERIOD —

Note on the Authorities for the First Period. 139

Chapter I: The Early Mystics — Jelál-ud-Dín. Sultán Veled. Yúnus Imre. ʿAshiq Pasha 141

Chapter II: The Beginning of Secular Poetry — Teftázání. Cadi Burhán-ud-Dín 201

Chapter III: The First Ottoman Poets — Ahmed. Niyází. Suleymán Chelebi. 225

Chapter IV: Riveting the Yoke — Prince Suleymán's Poets. Ahmed-i Dáʿí 249

Chapter V: The Romancists — Ahmedí 260

Chapter VI: The Romancists (continued) — Sheykhí. 299

Chapter VII: The Hurúfís — Nesímí. Refíʿí 336

Chapter VIII: The Scribe and his Sons — Saláh-ud-Dín. Yaziji-oghli Mehemmed. 389

Chapter IX: Minor Poets — Lyric Writers. Mevlevís. Romancists . 411

Chapter X: Concluding Remarks — The Position at the Close of the First Period. Eastern and Western Culture in the Middle Ages . . 441

APPENDIX: —

First Lines of the Turkish Text of the Poems translated in Volume I. 451

BOOK I

INTRODUCTORY.

CHAPTER I.

THE ORIGIN, CHARACTER AND SCOPE OF OTTOMAN POETRY.

A long road lies before us. We are about to trace the rise and development of poetry among the Ottoman Turks, a people whose literary history began six hundred years ago and is still in progress. We shall first have to try to catch some glimpse of the earliest efforts of this poetry in the far off days of the founders of the Empire; then we shall have to watch it feeling its way, now in this direction, now in that, while the Ottoman power itself is being gradually evolved; next we shall see it spreading its wings in surer flight as prosperity and security bring increase of culture; then we shall trace its brilliant course through the seventeenth century, when of a truth it held the gorgeous East in fee; after which we shall pursue its devious track through the years that follow, look upon its struggles and its failures, till at length we see it in these latest days burst forth once again in strong fresh life, more vigorous, more buoyant, more hopeful than ever it had been in the days of the Suleymáns or the Ahmeds.

But before setting out on our journey through the ages, it will be well to equip ourselves for the road by getting some idea as to what have been the aims and tendencies

of Ottoman poetry, what the conditions under which it has been developed, and what the forms of verse in which it has found expression. We shall therefore first of all try to learn something of the general characteristics of this poetry and of the circumstances which have influenced these; after which we shall look at its outward structure.

Ottoman poetry falls into two great divisions which we may call the Old or Asiatic School and the New or European School. The first of these rules unchallenged from the very outset down to the middle of the nineteenth century, when the second makes its appearance and in the course of a very few years wholly supersedes its worn-out rival. This second school differs so widely not merely in the outward form of its verse, but in its whole bent and purpose from all that goes before, that it will be better to leave it to be treated apart later on, and to confine ourselves for the present to the consideration of the Old or Asiatic School.

The Old School of Ottoman poetry covers a period of five and a half centuries; and although during this long time it naturally passed through many stages and underwent many modifications, its unity was never broken; what its form and purpose were in the fourteenth century, that in all essential points they were in the nineteenth.

The five and a half centuries occupied by this School may be conveniently divided into Four Periods. The First of these will cover the century and a half which extends between A. D. 1300, when the Empire was established, and A. D. 1450; during this Period, which might be called the Formative Age, the Western branch of the Turkish language [1] was being

[1] The Turkish language extends through Central and Western Asia from the frontier of China to the shores of the Mediterranean. Those dialects that are spoken between China and Persia are grouped together under the name of East-Turkish, those that prevail between Persia and the Mediterranean under that of West-Turkish.

fitted to become a literary medium. The Second Period, which will embrace the hundred and fifty years between 1450 and 1600, marks the time when, the initial difficulties with the language having been overcome, the poets were able to give their chief attention to the study and reproduction of the methods of the contemporary Persian school, that school at whose head stood the illustrious Jámí. The Third Period will cover the seventeenth century; it is marked by the yet further Persianisation of Ottoman poetry, and by the supersession of Jámí by ʿUrfí, and later by Sá'ib, as literary model. The Fourth Period, which will embrace the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth, differs from the others in being an age of uncertainty. At first many of the poets follow the Persian Shevket; then there comes a reaction against Persianism [1] and an unsuccessful attempt to give a more Turkish character to poetry; this again is followed by a time in which all guiding principle seems to be lost and poetry to be drifting helplessly back to an effete and colourless Persianism. And it is upon this moribund and hopeless age that the sun of the new culture, the culture of the West, arises, bringing fresh life where lay the shadow of death, and bright with happy promise for the future.

Of course the dates mentioned in connection with those Four Periods must not be considered as hard and fast boundary-lines, a thing so subtle as a literary tendency does not admit of being mapped out with any such definiteness. But looked at broadly, these divisions will be found to correspond to as many distinct movements; and they will, moreover, prove of considerable assistance in a systematic study of the development of this poetry.

[1] By the term 'Persianism' I mean here and elsewhere, not a Persian idiom, but Persian culture as adopted by the Ottomans, and more especially, as applied by them to matters connected with literature.

That great race to which the Ottomans belong, that race which includes not only the Turks both Western and Eastern, but all the so-called Tartars and Turkmans as well as the Mongols, has never produced any religion, philosophy or literature which bears the stamp of its individual genius. This is because the true genius of that race lies in action, not in speculation. The Turks and their kinsfolk are before all things soldiers. The societies which they formed in early times, before the introduction of Islam into Central Asia, were almost exclusively for military purposes. When the expedition was at an end, the several clans, families or individuals who had banded together for a common purpose most often dispersed, very soon to become members of some new and equally impermanent combination. Had there been nothing else, the unceasing restlessness of this mode of life would have been enough to prevent these people from elaborating any profound theory of the universe or developing anything in the way of literature beyond a mere folk-poetry.

The distinguishing qualities of the Turkish race have ever been the essentially military virtues of courage and loyalty. Of their courage it is needless to speak; all the world knows how from the beginning down to the present hour courage has been the birthright of every true Turk. Their loyalty has been no less persistent, and has manifested itself in many directions. It forms the basis of what is perhaps the most striking characteristic of Ottoman literature. It is well exemplified in the relation of the race to Islam. The Turks are not naturally a people of strong religious feeling. While left to themselves, they had no definite religion; in ancient times, before foreign missionaries came among them, such religious notions as they had were confined to a vague nature-worship. By and by some among them became, under outside influence, Buddhists or Christians; afterwards the great majority of the

race accepted Islam, not because that religion was peculiarly in harmony with their native genius, but as a result of the circumstances in which they found themselves. Yet from that day to this the Turks have with unflinching courage and unfaltering loyalty defended the religion to which they thus tendered their allegiance. They have not argued much about it, neither have they sought to force it upon other nations; but whenever it has been attacked they have been the foremost of its defenders. In like manner have the Turks carried the military spirit of their race into all the relationships they have formed; as faithful soldiers, when they receive an order, do not discuss but obey it, so this people, when they accept a system, do not criticise but stand by it. This unquestioning loyalty to principles once accepted lies at the root of the Turkish character. We shall see how it has acted upon their literature.

Though unable to originate any literature which should give expression to the true genius of their race, the Turkish peoples were very far from despising, or even undervaluing, culture. Consequently, when they were brought into close connection with the Persians, although they despised the latter as men, looking upon them as braggarts and cowards, they at once recognised their superiority in learning and culture. And so the Turks forthwith appropriated the entire Persian literary system down to its minutest detail, and that in the same unquestioning and whole-hearted fashion in which they had already accepted Islam. Here again they did not pause to consider whether this Persian culture were really in harmony with their own genius, they did not even attempt to modify it to suit that genius; on the contrary, they sought to adapt the latter to it, and to force themselves to think upon Persian lines and to look upon things through Persian eyes. Their loyalty to the system thus accepted explains the

secret of the long duration of the Old School of Ottoman poetry; and indeed this fidelity of five and a half centuries to a single tradition is the most truly Turkish characteristic which that poetry has to show.

From the very beginning then of their literature the Ottomans made it their practice to select and incorporate into their language such Persian and Persianised Arabic words and terms as were felt to be necessary to fill up the deficiencies in their native Tartar dialect. These new-comers, while each retained its original form unchanged, were all, so to speak naturalised, being subjected in every point to the rules of Turkish speech; they were woven into the Turanian groundwork of the language, and thus the Persian was Turkicised, not the Turkish Persianised. As time went on more and more of such additions were made; Persian ideas and canons of taste were adopted and incorporated; so that the language of the Second and later Periods comes to have the effect of an elaborate mosaic.

It is not too much to say that during the whole of the five and a half centuries covered by the Old School, though more especially during the Third Period, every Persian and every Arabic word was a possible Ottoman word. In thus borrowing material from the two classical languages a writer was quite unrestricted save by his own taste and the limit of his knowledge; all that was required was that in case of need he should give to the foreign words a Turkish grammatical form. Since the rise of the New School this license has been greatly curtailed. While the tendency has grown to drop such of these words as have failed to naturalise themselves, it has become the practice to confine this borrowing to really necessary terms — chiefly scientific or technical expressions — which are often introduced under forms or in combinations unknown in the original language, precisely

as we employ Greek or Latin terms for similar purposes. But the principle has not changed; what was formerly done with Persian and Arabic is being repeated, though with far more discretion, in these days with French. Western words and Western idioms, necessary to give expression to new ideas born of a new civilisation, are driving the old Asian phraseology from its time-honoured throne and becoming part and parcel of the living language of to-day. So far as the mere language is concerned, the effect obtained by reading successively three poems, one of the Second Period, one of the Fourth, and one of the present day, might be compared to that produced by the shifting combinations seen in a kaleidoscope, a succession of brilliant devices, alike in general character, but differing in detail, with each individual member standing out distinct and clear.

This system of assimilation was of course not restricted merely to words and phrases; it extended to everything connected with letters. We shall find that the tone and spirit of Ottoman poetry have been profoundly affected by those foreign literatures which have been accepted as models; while it is still more indebted to them for its imagery, subjects and verse-forms. In the case of the Old School the literature thus accepted was, as we know, that of Persia, and before proceeding to examine Turkish poetry itself, let us see whether we can discover what were the circumstances which created Persia the literary instructor of the Ottoman people [1].

A mere tribe of rude and unlettered nomads was the little Turkish clan which in the thirteenth century of our era, flying

[1] Some authorities would have it that Ottoman literature is modelled rather on Arabic than on Persian. But such is not the case, except perhaps in theological and legal writings; in belles lettres, and especially in poetry, Persian alone is followed. No Ottoman poet ever modelled his style on that of an Arab poet; whereas every Ottoman poet sought to reproduce something of the manner of one or other of the Persian masters.

before the terrible armies of Jengíz Khan, left its home in Central Asia and followed Suleymán Sháh into Anatolia. On their arrival in that land these new-comers, who by and by were to form the nucleus of the Ottoman power, found established there another Turkish people, the Seljúqs, who had by this time attained a very considerable degree of culture, thanks entirely to Persian tutorage. For these Seljúqs had been originally, like the forefathers of the Ottomans, a barbarous Tartar clan. About the middle of the eleventh century they had overrun Persia, when, as has so often happened, the barbarian conquerors adopted the culture of their civilised subjects. Rapidly the Seljúq Turks pushed their conquests westward, ever carrying with them Persian culture, till towards the end of the eleventh century they founded the famous Seljúq Turkish Empire of Rúm or Asia Minor, with Qonya, the ancient Iconium, as its capital. So when some hundred and fifty years later, Suleymán's son Er-Toghrul and his clansmen penetrated into Asia Minor they found that although Seljúq Turkish was the everyday speech of the people, Persian was the language of the court, while Persian literature and Persian culture reigned supreme.

Er-Toghrul at once acknowledged himself the vassal of the Seljúq Sultan, a step in which he was followed by his son ʿOsmán who is reckoned the first monarch of the Empire which takes from him its name of ʿOsmánli or Ottoman. The feeble Seljúq court, perceiving the courage and hardihood of ʿOsmán and his sturdy followers, entrusted to them as a feudal domain a district in the north-west of the Empire, bordering on the Byzantine territory. Hardly were ʿOsmán and his clansmen settled in their new home before the Seljúq Empire fell to pieces, shattered by the irresistible onslaught of the Mongol hosts. The western portion of the Empire then split up into ten petty kingdoms, each under an

independent Turkish chieftain, by whose name it continued to be known so long as it enjoyed a separate existence. These little kingdoms, which together formed what has been called the West-Turkish Decarchy, were gradually merged in that of Orkhan and his successors, whereupon the inhabitants, Turks themselves like the Ottomans, readily amalgamated with these latter, whence it comes that by far the greater portion of the people known to the world as Ottoman Turks have, almost from the outset, been in reality Seljúqs who have adopted the Ottoman name.

It is to the Seljúqs with whom they were thus fused that the Ottomans, strictly so called, owe their literary education; this therefore was of necessity Persían as the Seljúqs knew no other. Moreover, as from the very beginning of the Empire the name of Ottoman was, as we have just seen, extended to all men of Turkish race as they passed under the sceptre of the ᶜOsmánli Sultan [1], a great deal of what we call Ottoman poetry is the work of men who were Ottomans in a political sense alone. But this makes little practical difference, as these writers were all alike, whether originally Ottomans or not, Turks who had been educated on exclusively Persian lines.

What the Ottoman did when he succeeded to the heritage of the Seljúq was to create Turkish literature. Up till then there had been no Turkish literature worthy of the name. When a Turk had wished to write he had, with a few rare

[1] The name Ottoman is a corruption of the Turkish ᶜOsmánli which properly means a follower of ᶜOsmán, and would be exactly rendered by the term 'Osmanite'. It was originally applied to those Turks, whether his own clansmen or other, who were subject to ᶜOsmán the first Sultán. But as the Empire of his successors increased, the name was extended to embrace all Turks included within it. Thus it frequently happened in those early times that men who were not 'Ottomans' one year, found themselves such the following. Nowadays the name is still further extended to include all the subjects of the Sultan whether Turkish or non-Turkish.

and, from a literary point of view, unimportant exceptions, made use of the Persian language. Henceforth, decreed the Ottoman, let the Turk who would address the world speak in his own tongue. But how to evoke a literary language from that chaos of rude tribal and local dialects? The first thing needful was surely some guide to show how thought should be expressed, some standard by which to determine the kind of phraseology to be used. As to this guide and standard there could be no hesitation, for there was no choice. The Turks knew but one literature, that of Persia on which they had been reared. And thus this brilliant literature became, not by selection, but by force of circumstances, the model after which the Turks should fashion that they were about to found.

This acceptance of Persian guidance was immensely facilitated by the fact that the native Turkish verse — as it found expression in the folk-songs and popular ballads — had already much in common with the Persian system. Metres and verse-forms, somewhat vague and rough-hewn it is true, but very similar in lilt and shape to certain Persian varieties, were in existence among the Turks as products of genuine home-growth. Consequently when the question arose of elaborating a vehicle for literary poetry, it was not altogether met by a mere wholesale borrowing from outside, but to a certain extent by the working up of already existing materials to more perfect conformity with the accepted standard. In this way a good many points in the technique of Turkish verse, though now identical with their counterparts in the Persian system, are in their origin not, as superficially appears, loans from that system, but genuine native elements that have been artificially brought into complete conformity with it. This, however, is a matter of historical interest only, as every distinctively Turkish characteristic has been carefully

pruned away, and the conformity brought about is so perfect that for all that appears on the surface, these elements might, like the rest, have been taken over directly from the Persians.

As we have already seen, the Turks were not content with learning from the Persians how to express thought; they went to them to learn what to think and in what way to think. In practical matters, in the affairs of everyday life and in the business of government, they preferred their own ideas; but in the spheres of science, philosophy and literature they acknowledged only too freely their deficiency; and there they went to school with the Persian, intent not merely on acquiring his methods, but on entering into his spirit, thinking his thoughts and feeling his feelings. And in this school they continued so long as there was a master to teach them; for the step thus taken at the outset developed into a practice, it became the rule with the Turkish poets to look ever Persia-ward for guidance and to follow whatever fashion might prevail there. Thus it comes about that for centuries Ottoman poetry continued to reflect as in a glass the several phases through which that of Persia passed. So much for Turkish loyalty.

It behoves us therefore at this point to learn something of the character of this Persian poetry which has so profoundly affected that we are about to study. In so doing we shall of course pass over those sides of this poetry, such as the epic, which have had no influence in moulding Turkish verse, and confine ourselves to these that have inspired and directed the Ottoman poets. And the matters at which we are now about to look have the greater claim on our attention in that they were so thoroughly assimilated by the Turkish poets that although originally Persian, they are every whit as characteristic of the poetry of the Ottomans as of that from which they were borrowed.

Long before the time that the Ottoman determined to create a Turkish literature the Persian genius had recovered from the eclipse brought about by the Arab conquest, and the Persian poetic system was fully developed and securely established. The first period of Persian poetry, that robuster and more virile period which had produced the great national epic, was past and gone, and for a century and a half poetry had been in the hands of mystics who deliberately turned away from the things of earth and sang in the language of love, borrowed from their predecessors, of the passionate yearning of the soul for God. And so by this time the Persian mystic-philosophic system was, like the Persian poetic system, completely elaborated and organised. The Turks thus found these two systems — the poetic and the mystic-philosophic — both fully evolved, and they accepted both in their entirety. They found moreover that the two systems were in close alliance; the poet was most often a mystic, and the mystic most often a poet. This too they accepted as part of the order of nature; and for ages afterwards the phraseology of the mystics continued to form no small portion of the Ottoman poet's stock in trade.

It would be interesting to enquire into the origin and development of these two systems, of which the one is as the body and the other as the soul of old Ottoman poetry. But the study would take us too far afield; so we must be content to follow the example of the Turks themselves and accept the two as ready made, restricting our attention to what they were when our story opens, and letting pass the question how they came to be such. The first, the poetic system, we shall consider in detail in another chapter; but of the second, the mystic-philosophic system, we may here say a few words that will be helpful to us when studying the writings of the Ottoman poets.

This mystic-philosophic system, which the Persians and Turks call ʿIlm-i Tasavvuf, a term usually rendered as 'Súfíism,' has been well described as an idealistic pantheism. It has two sides; the one philosophic, the other mystic. These are closely interwoven, in reality they are but two aspects of a single whole; but like those iridescent shells which show one or another tint according to the light in which they are viewed, Súfíism presents its one or other aspect according to the standpoint from which it is regarded. The poets, unless they are avowed teachers of the system, regard it almost wholly from the mystic side, and leave the philosophic comparatively unnoticed. We may therefore pass by the latter till we come to consider the various philosophies current among the Turks, and for the present confine our attention to the former, which is the real source of inspiration of well nigh all Persian and Ottoman poetry.

Of the many who have sought to present the transcendental aspect of the Súfí system none has been more successful than the great Persian poet Jámí. In a magnificent canto in the Introduction to his beautiful poem on the story of Joseph and Zelíkhá [1] he tells how and why the universe arose; and the account he gives, which may be taken as the Eastern poets' Confession of Faith, is in substance as follows.

God, whom Súfís and poets generally speak of as 'The Truth,' is at once Absolute Being, the only Real Existence

[1] The whole canto has been admirably translated by Mr. E. G. Browne in his excellent article on Súfíism which appears in the volume entitled 'Religious Systems of the World' (Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., 1892). This translation is reprinted in the same scholar's 'Year amongst the Persians' (Black, 1893), a work which cannot be too highly recommended; the student will learn more concerning the real life and thought of modern Persia from this one book than from all the other records of travel that have yet been published.

that ever has been or ever can be, therefore necessarily comprising within Himself all apparent existences whatsoever; and Absolute Good, therefore necessarily Absolute Beauty, Beauty being one side or aspect of Good. Such is the Divine Nature; and having learned this, we may perceive how the phenomenal universe came into existence; for this, unlike the Absolute, is temporal, not eternal.

Ere yet time was, God dwelt alone in unrevealed loveliness and glory; alone in solitary radiance shone Absolute Beauty; no eye was there to gaze enraptured on Its unspeakable fairness, no heart to thrill in ecstasy at Its all-perfect harmony. None was there to see It, none to love It:

> 'To Its own self It sang of loveliness,
> 'With Its own self It cast the die of love.

Now, as we all know, a marked characteristic of Beauty, whatever be the form it may assume, is an innate desire of self-manifestation. Thus a beautiful face is impatient of concealment and ever desires to be seen; similarly, when a beautiful thought or conception occurs to the mind, it is not content to be buried away out of sight, but seeks expression through language or through art, as the case may be. This is so because the desire of self-expression is an essential attribute of the Absolute Beauty whereof these phenomenal forms are so many partial manifestations. The phenomenal universe then results from this desire of self-manifestation on the part of Absolute Beauty. This is very clearly expressed in a famous Hadís or 'Apostolic Tradition,' continually on the lips of the poets, in which God, in answer to a question of David as to why He had created man, replies, 'I was a Hidden Treasure, therefore

[1] نوای دلبری با خویش میساخت * قمار عاشقی با خویش میباخت

was I fain to be known, and so I created creation in order that I should be known.' [1]

But how was this manifestation thus demanded by the Divine Nature to be brought about? It is an axiom that things can be known only through their opposites or negations. [2] Thus it would be impossible for us to form the conception of light, were we ignorant of its opposite or negation, not-light, that is, darkness. Now the opposite or negation of Absolute Being, which is one and the same with Absolute Beauty and Absolute Good, is necessarily Not-Being, Not-Beauty, Not-Good. But such can have no real existence, for all real existence is of necessity comprised in Absolute Being, of which this is the negation. Not-Being is then only a

[1] كُنْتُ كَنْزًا مَخْفِيًا فَاَحْبَبْتُ اَنْ اُعْرَفَ فَخَلَقْتُ الْخَلْقَ لِاُعْرَفَا

A Hadís is a traditional saying of the Prophet Muhammed handed down from one or more of his Companions. There is a great number of such, and the well-authenticated among them rank in authority second to the Koran. When, as in the above, the true speaker is God, and the Prophet is but the voice, the Tradition is called a Hadís-i Qudsí or 'Divine Tradition;' when on the other hand the Prophet is at once speaker and voice, it is a Hadís-i Sherif or 'Blessed Tradition.'

[2] This forms a text for Jelál-ud-Dín in the fifth story of the first book of the Mesneví, where he says:

رنج و غمرا حق پیء آن آفرید * تا بدین ضدْ خوش دلی آید پدید

پس نهانیها بضد پیدا شود * چونکه حقرا نیست ضد پنهان بود

پس بضد نور دانستی تو نور * ضدّ ضدرا مینماید در صدور

'The Truth hath created pain and sorrow for this reason
'That through these opposites joyousness may become known.
'Thus hidden things become manifest through their opposites.
'Since The Truth hath no opposite He remaineth concealed.
'Thus by the opposite of light hast thou known light.
'Opposite showeth opposite in all things.'

A very good idea of the nature and scope of the Mesneví can be obtained from Mr. E. H. Whinfield's abridged translation, 'Masnavi i Ma^{c}navi, The Spiritual Couplets of Maulána Jalálu-'d-Dín i Rúmí,' Trübner & Co., 1887.

phantasm evoked for a season and for a special purpose. Again, in that it is the antithesis of the Divine Nature, Not-Being is also Not-Good, or, as we should say, is Evil. Here then we have the Eastern mystic's explanation of the Mystery of Evil comprised in his explanation of the Mystery of Creation. As Absolute Being could be known only through Its negation Not-Being, so Absolute Good could be known only through Its negation Not-Good; and as Absolute Being and Absolute Good are one, so also are Not-Being and Not-Good. Evil has therefore no real existence; there is no Absolute Evil as there is Absolute Good; by its very nature Evil is temporary and limited, it is but an illusion which the conditions of manifestation have rendered necessary for a while.

The process of manifestation was accomplished thus. When Not-Being became opposed to Being there appeared on the former, as in a mirror, a reflection or shadow of the latter.[1] This reflection, which partakes of the nature of both Being and Not-Being, is called Contingent Being, and is none else than the phenomenal universe in which during this life we find ourselves and of which we form part. The phenomenal universe has thus no real objective existence; it is but the reflection of Absolute Being cast on the mirror Not-Being. This has been well illustrated by the reflection cast by the

[1] In Mahmúd-i Shebisterí's Gulshen-i Ráz, or 'Mystic Rose-bower,' one of the text-books of Súfíism, we read:

عدم آیینه هستی هست مطلق * کزو پیداست عکس تابش حق

عدم چون کشت هستیرا مقابل * درو عکسی شد اندر حال حاصل

'Not-Being is the mirror, Being is the Absolute
'Wherefrom is manifested the reflection of the effulgence of The Truth.
'When Not-Being became opposed to (was set opposite) Being
'A reflection was straightway produced thereon.'

See Mr. Whinfield's scholarly edition and translation of the Gulshen-i Ráz (Trübner, 1880).

sun on a pool. [1] This reflection owes such existence as it has entirely to the sun; the moment the sun withdraws itself the reflection ceases to exist, and while the reflection is thus wholly dependent on the sun, the sun is absolutely independent of it, can indeed renew it an infinity of times without sustaining the slightest loss thereby. The pool is thus the mirror of the sun, as Not-Being is the mirror of Being, and the reflection cast on the water typifies the phenomenal universe. As the universe is thus the image of Absolute Being, that is of God, reflected in the mirror Not-Being, so, they continue, is man the eye in that image, and as when we look in a mirror, we perceive a small image of ourselves reflected in the pupil, so is the image of God reflected in this eye which is man. Thus is God revealed unto Himself and unto man, and thus moreover does man contain in himself the image of God. [2]

Man, like the phenomenal universe in which he finds himself, and of which he presents an epitome, is double-natured, partaking at once of Being and Not-Being, of Good and Evil, of Reality and Unreality. But as that side of him which derives from Being, and which therefore alone has a real and eternal existence, is necessarily an emanation of Divinity, he is, so far, ultimately and essentially one with

[1] See Mr. Browne's article on Súfiism, p. 330.

[2] In the Gulshen-i Ráz we read:

عدم آیینه عالم عکس و انسان * چو چشم عکس دروی شخص پنهان

تو چشم عکسی واو نور دیده‌ست * بدیده دیده‌را دیده دیده‌ست

'Not-Being is the mirror, the universe is the reflection, and man
'Is like the eye in the reflection, (an eye) wherein is a hidden image (i. e. the image of God reflected in the pupil.)
'Thou art the eye in the reflection, and He (God) is the Light of the eye;
'With the (human) eye, the eye (i. e. man) eyeth that Eye (i. e. God who seeth all things.)'

God. This Divine particle in man, this spark of Pure Being, is ever seeking, consciously or unconsciously, to be reunited to its source; but so long as the phenomenal state lasts, the presence of the element of Not-Being holds it back. Man's business then is to eliminate, so far as may be, this element of Not-Being, and to attain to that union with God, that absorption into the Divine, which, though to be fully achieved only after the death of the body, is possible in a certain measure even in this present life.

But how is one to overcome the element of Not-Being? By conquering self; for self, which seems so real, is in truth the supreme illusion as it the cause of all our woe. For what are we to talk of self? We have no self; whatever we have of Real Being is God's, not ours; the rest is mere nothingness, the negation of Being, the negation of Good, to hug which can bring only sorrow.

And how is self to be conquered? By Love. By Love, and by Love alone, can the dark shadow of Not-Being be done away; by Love, and by Love alone, can the soul of man win back to its Divine source and find its ultimate goal in reunion with The Truth. And the first lessons of this Love, which is the keynote of Súfiism and of all the literature it has inspired, may be, nay, must be learned through a merely human passion. Than true love 'there is no subtler master under heaven.' In the poem already quoted, Jámí tells of a would-be disciple who came craving instruction from a master of the mystic lore, when the master, having ascertained that this youth had never loved, bade him go back into the world, learn what to love means, and then return.

But this human love, good and helpful though it is, is not itself the end, it is but the means to the end; it is the 'Bridge' across which the pilgrim of The Truth must pass.

It is called the 'Typal' Love in contradistinction to the 'Real,' which is the Divine Love; and no watchword of the mystics is more often quoted by the poets than this pregnant phrase 'the Typal is the Bridge to the Real.' [1] But fair as the Bridge may be, the pilgrim must beware of lingering thereon, lest haply he should fail to reach his journey's end. Once across, his eyes are opened, his heart is made clairvoyant through Divine Love; wherever he turn his gaze he sees the Face of God; God shines down on him from every star in the sky, God looks up at him from every flower in the field, God smiles on him in every fair face, God speaks to him in every sweet sound; all around him there is God, nothing but God. If he turn his eyes inward and look into his own heart, there he can read letter by letter the very heart of God. For he has now become one with God, knowing and feeling that there is naught beside God; and he can cry out with Mansúr 'I am The Truth!' [2] and exclaim with Báyezíd of Bistám 'There is none other than God within my cloak!' [3]

On such lines proceeds the mystic philosophy which the Turks learned from the Persians, and of which the echo, if not the living voice, rings for centuries in their poetry. In the language of the mystic poets God is 'the Beloved,' man

[1] The Arabic runs: اَلْمَجَازُ قَنْطَرَةُ الْحَقِيقَةِ. For 'typal' we might equally read 'allegoric,' 'the Allegoric is the Bridge to the True.'

[2] Huseyn Mansúr-i Halláj, that is, Huseyn Mansúr the Wool-Carder, is, so to speak, the patron saint of the Súfís, and his name is of frequent occurrence in the pages of the poets, who always mention him in terms of love and veneration. In A. H. 310 (A. D. 923) he was put to a cruel death by the doctors of Baghdad on a charge of blasphemy for having exclaimed while in a state of mystic ecstasy انا الحق 'I am The Truth!' i. e. 'I am God!' When the poets mention Mansúr it is usually in association with this famous phrase.

[3] Báyezíd of Bistám was a very famous saint of early times; he is said to have been born in A. H. 160 (A. D. 776-7) and to have lived to be nearly a hundred years of age.

'the lover.' Under the figure of the lover's anguish at separation from his loved one they show forth the yearning of the soul of man for the Divine Soul whence it came; by the symbol of the cruel self-sufficiency of the beloved, frenzying the distracted lovers by half-revealed glimpses of a beauty no words may tell, they picture those momentary flashes which from time to time light up the soul, bringing it for an instant face to face with Reality, and vanishing ere their presence is realised. The poets see the presence of God immanent in all beautiful things, but manifested most clearly and most fully in fair humanity. Therefore is it good to love and to admire such, for through this is revealed most perfectly the Beauty of the Godhead. And even as it is God who is mirrored in the fair face, it is God, the poet feels, who looks through the lover's eyes; God beholds and loves God, and the supreme miracle of Divine self-manifestion is accomplished.

Bound up with this mystic side of Súfíism is the famous allegory of the 'Primal Compact.' In a somewhat obscure passage of the Koran, God is represented as having, before the creation of the world, summoned into His presence the as yet unembodied souls of all who were to dwell on earth, and as having put to each one individually the question: E-lestu bi-rabbikum? 'Am not I your Lord?' to which each soul replied: Belá! 'Yea!' [1] The poets are fond of imagining that it is the echo of this never quite forgotten oath of fealty, sworn before time was, which, ringing through the soul, impels it to that quest of The Truth where alone it is in harmony with its true being; and when they would tell of it in ecstatic trance, rapt and beside itself at some

[1] The actual words of the Koran (vii, 171) are: And when thy Lord took from the children of Adam out of their loins their seed, and made them bear witness against themselves, 'Am not I your Lord?' They said,—'Yea, we do bear witness.'

glimpse of the Divine Beauty, they picture it as 'drunken' with the 'Wine of E-lest' quaffed in eternity at the 'Primal Feast.'

The early Súfí poets had taken the current phraseology of the contemporary singers of love and wine, and by imparting a mystic signification to the terms thus adopted, they had constructed a species of symbolic language in which, for example, 'wine' represents the mystic love, 'the vintner' the teacher thereof, 'the tavern' the place where it is taught, just as the 'Beloved' stands for God, and the 'lover' for man. According to certain commentators this vocabulary was carried to an extreme point of elaboration, every object mentioned by the poet being typal of some philosophic or mystic conception; thus the 'cheek' of the Beloved represents the cosmos, the 'tresses' the mystery of the Godhead, and so on. Commentaries have been written on Háfiz in which the whole of that poet's works are interpreted in this 'spiritual' fashion; but it is extremely doubtful whether he or any other poet ever systematically wrote upon such lines. None the less the shadow of this symbolism never entirely passes away; it lingers as a vague reminiscence all through Turkish poetry.

According as mysticism or materialism is predominant in the poet's temperament, will the symbolic or the literal predominate in his work. As a rule both elements are present, subtly and inextricably blended, now the one and now the other advancing into the foreground and sinking into the rear. This poetry thus floats between the sensuous and the supersensuous; Love and Beauty are presented in their fairest and most seductive garb, but so deft is the presentation that the reader finds himself free to interpret as he pleases; and so, as has been said, the same poem which delights the libertine will raise the saint to ecstasy.

There are again many poets who are primarily artists in words; these take such things for what they are worth as decorative adjuncts, and work them into their verses to produce some desired æsthetical effect. For it must be borne in mind that while many among the Turkish poets were truly Súfís, and some even devoted their whole strength to the exposition and elucidation of their doctrine, others, and they are perhaps the majority, merely play with Súfí ideas and Súfí phrases. When the Turks took over the Persian poetic system they found these ideas and phrases ready to hand, and these became, along with many other things similarly acquired, so many 'studio properties' for the poet, to be introduced into his works as occasion might suggest.

At first sight it may appear strange that doctrines such as we have been considering should flourish side by side with the absolute monotheism of Islam. As a matter of fact, however, Islam is much less rigid than is generally supposed, and there are many passages in both the Koran and the Hadís which readily lend themselves to a mystic interpretation,[1] and with these the Súfís, who have almost invariably made profession of Islam, have strongly fortified their position. But to properly understand this point, as well as many another seeming puzzle that will come under our observation, it is necessary to know, something of the true nature of the Persian genius. As has been well said by a thoughtful writer[2] who has seen deep into the Asian mind, we must ever keep before us the fact that while the European seeks almost unconsciously to impart a homogeneity to his conceptions by rejecting whatever is incompatible with the beliefs he holds or embraces, the Eastern, for whom

[1] Mr. Browne quotes several in the article already mentioned.

[2] The Conte de Gobineau in 'Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale,' Paris 1865.

exactitude has no such charm, is more concerned to preserve from loss or oblivion every minutest idea which the mind of man has conceived. The exactitude so dear to the European is distressful to the Asiatic in that it tends to circumscribe the flight of his imagination. He does not seek to make diverse theories and conceptions square with one another, nor does he perceive what would be the utility of such an operation; these diverse theories and ideas are for him so many different windows opening upon different aspects of the infinite; but he will brook no limitations in his dealings with the limitless. From the earliest ages Western Asia has been a hotbed of all manner of religious theories, not one of which has ever been wholly forgotten. More or less modified or disguised, these appear and reappear again and again; and during the course of the centuries they have given birth to numberless religious and philosophic systems all of which live on in one form or another. So in the mind of the Eastern thinker, intent to learn and retain all he can concerning spiritual things, there generally exist side by side fragments of many such systems often contrary one to the other as well as incompatible with some among the tenets of his avowed religion.

Though natural to the Persian, such an intellectual state as this is really quite foreign to the Turk who, as we have seen, is properly a man of action, not a speculator or dreamer. None the less the condition of mind just described is that which is most frequently mirrored in Ottoman poetry, and this simply because the Turkish poets here as elsewhere deliberately set to work to assimilate their thought to that of the Persians.

The dervish orders, which are very numerous in Turkey and Persia, and which bear a certain resemblance to the monastic orders of medieval Europe, are all more or less

connected with Súfíism. Each order traces its origin to some eminent Súfí sage or saint, whose name it usually bears; but although the members have always called themselves Súfís, in many cases they have paid but scant attention to their patron's teaching.

This last circumstance gave an additional impetus to a curious practice of the Persian and Turkish poets, namely, that of bitterly denouncing 'the Súfí' while themselves Súfís of the purest water. This seemingly paradoxical attitude of the poets arose in the first instance from the fact that the learning and piety of the early Súfís having gained for them a great reputation and attracted to them numerous disciples, there sprang up on every hand unscrupulous adventurers who gave themselves out as Súfís, and collected around them bands of dissolute and hypocritical fanatics. These the illiterate multitude taking at their own value, called by their unjustly usurped title of Súfí; and when the poets rail against 'the Súfí,' it is pretenders of this class, the 'Súfís' of the ignorant masses, that they have in view. [1]

Turning now to the external aspect of this poetry, we find that although at the outset Turkish verse was simple even to baldness, no sooner is the influence of Persia securely established than we are in the midst of a wilderness of ornament. Persian rhetoric is the counterpart of Persian art; and that, as everyone knows, is essentially decorative. Its merits, and they are great, lie exclusively in the beauty of its detail; the principle of the subordination of the parts

[1] In order to avoid confusion I shall in this work employ the term 'Súfí exclusively in its true sense of 'mystic;' although it is more often used by the Turkish poets in its second and degraded sense, in which case it is commonly pronounced Sofu. The poets, when speaking of the true mystics, sometimes wished to avoid the now dubious title of Súfí; they then generally employed some such term as 'Lovers' ('Ushsháq), 'Followers of Súfíism' (Ehl-i Tasavvuf), 'Followers of the Esoteric' (Ehl-i Bátin), or 'Sheykhs' (Meshá'ikh).

to the whole is unknown. In like manner is Persian poetry enveloped in a mass of incongruous and unconnected ornament. Metaphors and similes, homonyms and anagrams, and a host of other rhetorical embellishments, for many of which we have no names in English, crowd on one another's heels, and seem to jostle each other in their eagerness to amaze the reader. Individually these figures may be, and very often are, both graceful and ingenious, but they are thrown together without so much as a thought being given to their effect as a whole. The result is certainly brilliant, sometimes dazzling, but the dignity which comes of restraint and orderly procession is not there.

In this again Persian poetry faithfully mirrors the Oriental genius. As we have just learned, the Eastern is far more alive to the details of a subject than he is to the subject taken as a whole. This mental attitude is maintained in the presence of all phenomena, psychical and material alike; the true Oriental is ever in the position of the man who cannot see the wood on account of the trees. We have seen one result of this in the medley of fragments of heterogeneous systems that makes up his philosophy, we have here another in the chaos of promiscuous ornament that forms the decorative element in his poetry. Be it said in passing that through this mental habit, whereby so many aspects of a subject are simultaneously perceived, there arises a certain vacillation of judgment which in practical affairs has led to many disasters; for it is through this, as the author already quoted [1] has pointed out, that the Easterns, both as individuals and as nations, have, for all their courage and intelligence, been so often the victims of Europeans in many respects inferior to themselves, but possessed of a decision and resolution to which they are strangers.

[1] Conte de Gobineau.

A poetry which wantons, as does the Persian, in every kind of ambiguity of expression and far-fetched conceit must inevitably be extremely artificial; and artificiality is in fact one of the most prominent characteristics of this poetry. But this by no means necessarily implies lack of sincerity: for there have been in many literatures periods when it was natural to seek out subtleties of fancy and curiosities of language. [1]

The poetry of Persia is moreover intensely subjective, especially in those two branches, the lyric and the romantic, which have been most largely reproduced in Turkish. The poet rarely deals with external objects exclusively on their own merits. When he sings, as he constantly does, of wine and beauties, of roses and nightingales, it is not to tell of these as they are in themselves. What seems to strike him first and with greatest force is, not the effect which these produce upon his senses, but the suggestions they evoke in his mind. This is perhaps only what we should expect in the lyric poetry, but in the romantic we might have looked for a more objective treatment. To a limited extent we find such, more especially in early times; but the story — there are some dozen or so stories told and retold by poet after poet — is the least important part of a Persian romantic poem; it is but the excuse which the writer makes for the exposition of his doctrine, or may be merely for the display of his literary skill; and more often than not it is finally explained away altogether as an allegory.

Similarly, this poetry is highly conventional. It is replete with what are called stock epithets; the 'moon-face,' the 'cypress-form,' the 'ruby-lip,' occur with wearisome reiteration right through from the very beginning. In the same way,

[1] For example, the poetry of the Troubadours, and that of the so-called 'metaphysical' poets in England.

what we may term stock associations abound; when the 'nightingale' is mentioned we may be sure the 'rose' is not far away, and if we read of the 'moth' in one line we may feel safe about meeting the 'taper' in the next. But for all this, Persian poetry shows, within certain limits, extraordinary fertility of imagination, and not unfrequently an almost super-gracefulness both of thought and expression.

Such then is the nature of the poetry which Persia offered to the Turks, and which they, knowing of no other, accepted in its entirety, although it was in many respects out of harmony with the genius of their race. So the first Ottoman poets — and their successors through many a generation — strove with all their strength to write what is little else than Persian poetry in Turkish words. But such was not consciously their aim; of national feeling in poetry they dreamed not; poetry was to them one and indivisible, the language in which it was written merely an unimportant accident.

I have said that the spirit of Persian poetry is in many ways foreign to the Turkish genius; in some the two are directly opposed. The Turkish nature is simple, the Persian subtle. The objectivity of the Turkish popular songs is not less extreme than the subjectivity of Persian literary verse. Although from time to time it would strive to utter a feeble cry, for nearly four hundred years the Turkish spirit remained practically dumb in Turkish poetry, paralyzed in presence of the overmastering genius of Persia. But about the beginning of the eighteenth century the voice of the national spirit begins to be heard more clearly and persistently in the pages of the poets. A more objective note is struck, and the poet finds a manifest pleasure in singing of the things he actually sees and feels, not merely of those he has read about in some Persian book. A blithe and happy tone pervades his lines, and a frank honest delight in life and the joys of life.

The simple, pleasure-loving, happy-go-lucky Turkish spirit is at last allowed, not indeed to speak, but to whisper in Turkish poetry. But Turkish poetry was still far from being that which but for Persian teaching it might have been; there yet marred it many a fleck and many a flaw never wholly washed away till the reformers of our own day swept every vestige of Persian tradition into the limbo of forgotten things.

And so, helpful and beneficial as it in many ways undoubtedly was, guiding their timorous footsteps into the worlds of thought and art, Persian culture was yet upon the whole an ill-starred dower to the Turks. For with all the beauty and nobleness that invest it, Persian poetry seems to possess the Gorgon power of paralyzing the national spirit in the literature of every people that looks up to it. The poetry of Afghan, of Tartar, of Urdu-writing Indian is all, equally with that of the earlier Ottomans, just so much Persian poetry writ in other tongues; in every case the national spirit is silent, the spirit that speaks is that of Persia.

Moreover, just about the time that Ottoman poetry was definitively taking shape, the creative genius of Persia was stricken with a sterility from which it has never since recovered. What Persian poetry was in the fifteenth century, that to all intents and purposes it is to-day. During the intervening period it has indeed passed through several phases, but these have been marked merely by modifications in manner and diction; there has been no radical change from within, no infusion of fresh life from without. What the poets said in the days of Jámí they have gone on saying, varying from time to time the expressions and the metaphors, but never altering the substance or adding to the themes.

And thus for centuries Turkish poetry was, thanks to Persian precept and example, employed, not in interpreting

the Turkish genius, not in conquering new realms of thought, but in achieving within one narrow circle ever more brilliant and more subtle masterpieces of rhetoric. It is true that from the rugged Tartar dialect with which they started, the Persianising poets evolved a marvellous literary language so brilliant and so harmonious that the study of it is an æsthetic delight. But this beautiful language is so artificial, so far removed from everyday speech, that it has at all times been incomprehensible to ordinary men.

Thus Ottoman literary poetry has always been a closed book to the mass of the people. Without a special education no man could hope to understand it. The poets therefore wrote either for themselves or for the court; of the people they took no heed. To be a poet when Persian culture was at its height must obviously have demanded a more than ordinary education; and so we find that during that long period when poetry was valued in proportion as the learning was recondite and the rhetoric pretentious that adorned it, by far the greater number of its practitioners were members of the ʿUlemá.[1]

To point out the defects of such a poetry as this, — its artificiality, its obscurity, its exclusiveness, — is easy; to indicate its merits is less so. And this is because this poetry is before all things an art; and, to be appreciated, the merits of art-work of every kind must be felt rather than described. The old poets are in the first place stylists, and any attempt to explain beauties and subtleties of style to those ignorant

[1] The word ʿUlemá means literally 'learned men.' It is the collective title of the body of doctors of the canon law of Islam, who form the legal councillors of the state. In old times its members were *par excellence* the learned class, and naturally many among them played a great part in the history of Ottoman poetry. The organisation of the corps, which was at first simple, gradually became very complicated; but as some idea of it is necessary to a satisfactory understanding of the lives of many of the poets of the Second and later Periods, a sketch of it will be given in another volume.

of the poets' language were manifestly hopeless. With these poets manner comes before matter; what they say interests them comparatively little, the great point is how to say it. A score of themes sufficed them for centuries; these they present again and again, arrayed in ever increasing beauty of language and begemmed with ever subtler ingenuities of fancy, till their work comes to display a harmony of sound, a brilliancy of wit, and a deftness of manipulation capable of affording a keen æsthetic pleasure to those who by taste and education are fitted to receive it.

This was the goal of the Persianising poets, and they reached it.

CHAPTER II.

Tradition, Philosophy and Mysticism.

Among the Turks, as among the other peoples of Islam, intellectual life sprang from two distinct sources, of which the one was Semitic, the other Hellenic. From the first came religion, from the second came philosophy. Both religion and philosophy professed to interpret the universe; and the interpretations which they gave were not always in harmony. The vast majority of the vulgar and unlearned held exclusively by religion and utterly ignored philosophy, of which indeed they knew nothing. So did many among the more educated, who, though not wholly ignorant of philosophy, looked upon it with abhorrence as contrary to the revealed Word. Among the learned, while a few were philosophers and nothing else, though out of prudence they professed conformity to the popular faith, the majority, whatever might be their outward profession, held a creed which was in reality a compromise between the two, with a strong bias in favour of philosophy. This creed, if creed it can be called, was in great part the work of the Súfís or mystics who sought, among other things, to clothe philosophy in the language of religion; it was also to some extent the work of the Mutekellimín or Scholastics who endeavoured by a rational explanation of dogma to support

religion in the struggle with philosophy. But these last do not concern us here, as almost all the Ottoman poets were either Súfís or men who wrote in the language of the Súfís. As these poets, whether really Súfís or not, were perfectly acquainted with and made frequent allusion to, not merely the opinions and conceptions of their own sect, but those of the orthodox and the philosophers, it will be necessary for us to learn something concerning the tenets of all three parties.

The views of the religious are in all essentials those contained in the Jewish scriptures, and are consequently quite familiar to us; the only point that calls for special attention is their elaborate cosmogony which was borrowed almost wholly from Rabbinical traditions.

When God determined to manifest Himself through the creation of the world the first thing that He summoned into being was a glorious Radiance derived from His own Light. This is now generally called the 'Light of Muhammed' (Núr-i Muhammed)[1] because in after ages it was incarnated in the person of the last and greatest of the Prophets. When this Light burst into existence God looked on it and loved it and uttered this sentence, now one of the watch-words of Islam, 'But for thee, verily I had not created the heavens!'[2]

[1] Sometimes the 'Light of Ahmed' (Núr-i Ahmed), Ahmed being another form of the name Muhammed.

[2] لَوْ لَاكَ لَمَا خَلَقْتُ ٱلْأَفْلَاكَ. The heavens are not yet in existence, but God speaks as though their creation were an accomplished fact. This seeming discrepancy is thus explained. What we call 'time' exists not for God; in His eyes what we call 'present,' 'past' and 'future' are one eternal Now. He therefore sees things, in what to us is the future, as already existent, and speaks of them as accomplished facts. Instances of this abound in the Koran, especially in passages describing the Last Day and Final Judgment. The Koran, it must be remembered, professes to be the direct word of God; He is the speaker from beginning to end; the Prophet is nothing more than His ambassador charged with the delivery of His message to mankind.

And it was through this Light, and for its sake, that all things were made. For when God looked in love upon this Light, it 'perspired,' abashed before the Divine gaze; and from the subtlest essence that arose from its perspiration He created the First Soul, and then in a descending scale the souls of all the various orders of beings.

After a while God looked again upon the Light, and from its perspiration He created the corporeal world. The first thing that arose was the ᶜArsh, the 'Throne of God,' according to the usual interpretation; in any case, the first and most glorious of corporeal existences. Beneath the ᶜArsh, and of its light, God created another wondrous thing, which is called the Kursí, and may be conceived as the 'Footstool' below the Throne. [1]

God likewise created under the ᶜArsh, and of its light, a great 'Tablet' in colour as a green beryl, and a great 'Pen' in colour as an emerald, and filled with ink which was of white light. God cried to the Pen, 'Write, O Pen!' whereupon it moved over the Tablet and wrote thereon everything that should happen till the Last Day, and the Tablet was covered with the writing. [2] And thereon was then inscribed the Divine original of the Glorious Koran.

Beneath the Kursí, but somewhat to the right hand, God created a region like white pearl, in which is the 'Lote-tree none may pass.' [3] And this is the station of the Archangel

[1] Both the words ᶜArsh and Kursí occur in the Koran where both seem to be used in the sense of 'Throne.'

[2] This myth arose from a fanciful explanation of two passages in the Koran, in the first of which (lxviii, 1.) God swears 'By the Pen and what they write!' and in the second of which (lxxxv, 22.) occur the words 'Verily it is a glorious Lection on a Tablet Preserved!'

[3] This tree is alluded to in the Koran (liii, 13, 14.), 'And he saw him another time by the Lote-tree none may pass; near which is the Garden of the Abode.' — the reference being to the Prophet's vision of Gabriel on the occasion of his Ascension.

Gabriel, beyond which he may not go. And in this place is the root of the Túba-tree.

In a straight line below the ᶜArsh and Kursí, and of the light of the former, God created the Eight Paradises. These are arranged one within the other, in as many ascending stages, the innermost and highest of all being the 'Garden of Eden' (Jennet-i ᶜAdn) which overlooks all the others like a citadel on a lofty eminence in the midst of a walled city. [1] The distance between the ramparts that surround each Paradise is six thousand six hundred and sixty-six degrees, and each degree is a five-hundred years' journey. [2] The Paradises are generally represented as lovely gardens studded with beautiful palaces, the dwelling-places of the blessed. [3] They are watered by many rivers, notably by the Kevser, the Tesním and the Selsebíl, most of which have their source in the Garden of Eden whence they descend into the lower stages. The wonderful tree called the Túba or 'Beatitude,' the roots of

[1] The names of the Eight Paradises, and the materials of which they are formed, are as follows, beginning with the lowest: (1) 'The Mansion of Glory' (Dár-ul-Jelál), of white pearl; (2) 'The Mansion of Peace' (Dár-us-Selám), of red ruby; (3) 'The Garden of the Abode' (Jennet-ul-Mewa), of green chrysolite; (4) 'The Garden of Eternity' (Jennet-ul-Khuld) of yellow coral; (5) 'The Garden of Delight' (Jennet-un-Naᶜím), of white silver; (6) 'The Garden of Paradise' (Jennet-ul-Firdevs), of red gold; (7) 'The Garden of Abidance' (Jennet-ul-Qarár), of pure musk; (8) 'The Garden of Eden' (Jennet-ul-ᶜAdn), of lustrous pearl. Some writers, however, arrange the several stages differently.

[2] We are expressly told that these and similar expressions are not to be taken as actual measurements of distance; they are brought forward simply in order to convey the idea of vastness.

[3] It is perhaps scarcely necessary to refute once again the old calumny that Islam denies a soul to woman. No Muhammedan ever propounded or ever could propound any theory which could be so construed; and in face of the fact that the Koran explicitly and repeatedly speaks of men and women as equally heirs of eternity (ix, 69, 73; xiii, 22—23; xxxiii, 35; xxxvi, 56; xliii, 70; xlviii, 5, 6; lvii, 12; lxvi, 10:), it is difficult to imagine any other source for the libel than the deliberate malice of certain Christian writers.

which are in the region of the Lote-tree above the highest Paradise, sends its branches down into all the Eight Gardens, a shoot entering the abode of every inhabitant, just as the sun which is aloft in the skies sends its beams into every house on earth. The Garden of Eden is the scene of the Beatific Vision, the Divine Epiphanies, the sight of which will form the highest felicity of the blessed. The native inhabitants of Paradise are the houris,[1] maidens of celestial beauty and possessed of every virtue, who will be the heavenly brides and companions of the blessed, and the 'eternal youths' who will be the attendants on the just. The guardianship of Paradise is entrusted to an angel called Ridhwán.

Beneath the Eight Paradises are six seas, below which come the Seven Heavens. These latter are spread one above the other like seven tents or canopies, their edges resting on the seven outer of the eight ranges of Mount Qáf which, as we shall see, surround the earth. In the first or lowest Heaven is the so-called 'Frequented House' (Beyt-i Maᶜmúr).[2] This, which is a great dome of red ruby, was originally in the highest Paradise, the Garden of Eden, from which, on Adam's expulsion and subsequent repentance, it was brought to earth as a solace to him. It was placed where the Kaᶜba of Mekka now stands, and Adam was bidden compass it, as the pilgrims still compass the Kaᶜba; and the angels who dwell in the Seven Heavens were commanded to descend and perform the rite along with him. It remained on earth till Noah's time, but before the flood it was caught up to the spot in the lowest Heaven immediately above where it used to stand, and there it is daily visited by seventy thousand angels, and there it will rest till the Last Day when it will

[1] Pronounced 'hoorees.'

[2] This term occurs in the Koran (lii, 4.) where God swears by the Frequented House; but no description of it is given.

be taken back to its original place in Paradise. Abraham, at God's command, built the Kaʿba where the Frequented House formerly stood, so that were this to fall from Heaven, it would light upon the Kaʿba. The famous Black Stone, which is in the Kaʿba, and which all the pilgrims kiss, is a relic of the Frequented House; originally it was a red ruby, but at the flood God changed it into a black stone.

Immediately below the lowest Heaven is a sea of water; this lies above the air, and not a drop of it can fall through the air. Through this sea swim the sun, moon and stars, all under angelic guidance. Below this stellar sea, in the midst of the sea of air, half-way between heaven and earth, is another sea of water, whence rain is sent down to earth. An angel descends with every drop of rain, and lays it in its appointed place; these angels do not crowd one another, for they are incorporeal beings made of light.

The earth, which is flat, is surrounded, as by an eight-fold ring, by the eight mountain-chains of Qáf; these alternate with the Seven Seas, the innermost Qáf being within the innermost of the Seas, which bears the name of the 'Encircling Ocean' (Bahr-i Muhít). The breadth of each Qáf and of each Sea is a five-hundred years' journey; and round the outermost Qáf, which is outside of all, is wound a great snake. Only a small part of the earth's surface is inhabited, the proportion of this to the uninhabited being as the space enclosed by a tent to the desert in which the tent is pitched. It is in these unpeopled lands and in the unknown regions of the Qáfs and the Seven Seas, where dwell the jinn, that the tellers of fairy tales lay many of the scenes of their romances.

The earth we inhabit is the uppermost of seven, which are arranged one below the other like so many stages. At first this series of earths was unstable and tossed about like a ship on the surrounding seas; so God ordered a great

angel to grasp it and steady it on his shoulders. Under this angel God set a mighty rock, and under the rock a huge Bull, and under the Bull a great Fish, [1] and under the Fish an ocean, and under the ocean the seven stages of Hell, and under those a tempestuous wind, and under that a darkness, and under that a veil: and beyond this the knowledge of man goeth not.

The cosmogony which has just been outlined, though known to all, was accepted in its entirety only by the illiterate and the more narrow-minded of the ultra-orthodox; the views of the learned were for the most part far more in accordance with the teachings of philosophy. The philosophy of the Turks is of course derived directly from the Persian and Arabic writers, but it is ultimately Greek, being little more than a modification of the Neo-Platonism of the fifth and sixth centuries which combined Aristotelianism with the mysticism of Iamblichus. In Turkey the philosophers, while accepting the Alexandrian doctrine of Emanations, gave their chief attention to the Aristotelian aspect of the system; the Súfís, on the other hand, while acquiescing in the Aristotelian explanations of natural phenomena, devoted themselves almost exclusively to the theosophical side.

We shall deal firstly with the more strictly philosophical matters, which were accepted by both parties, and afterwards we shall consider the peculiar tenets of the Súfís.

Philosophy is divided into two great branches, namely, 'Theoretic or Speculative Philosophy' (Hikmet-i Nazarîye), which treats of matters beyond human control, and 'Practical

[1] In the names بهموت Behemút (?) and لوتيا Levitiyá (?), sometimes given respectively to this Bull and Fish, we seem to recognise the Behemoth and Leviathan of the Book of Job.

Philosophy' (Hikmet-i ᶜAmalíye), which treats of matters within human control. Each of these has three subdivisions. Those of Theoretic Philosophy are: (1) 'Metaphysic' or 'Theology' (ᶜIlm-i Iláhí), which treats of beings essentially incorporeal, as the 'First Cause' (Mebde-i Evvel),[1] the Intelligences and the Souls. (2) 'Mathematic' (ᶜIlm-i Riyází),[2] which treats of things conceivable by the mind as existing apart from matter, but which can have no objective existence save in matter, such as quantities and magnitudes and geometrical figures. This subdivision has four departments, namely, Astronomy, Geometry, Arithmetic and Music. (3) 'Physic' (ᶜIlm-i Tabíᶜí), which deals with things not to be conceived as existing apart from matter, as the Four Elements and all composed of them.[3] The three subdivisions of Practical Philosophy are: (1) 'Ethic' (ᶜIlm-i Akhláq), which treats of the duty of man considered as an individual. (2) 'Oeconomic' (ᶜIlm-i Tedbír-ul-Menzil), which treats of the duty of man considered as a member of a family or household. (3) 'Politic' (ᶜIlm-i Tedbír-ul-Medíne), which treats of the duty of man considered as a member of a community or state.[4]

All these subdivisions of philosophy are worked out in detail; but to examine them all, even in the most cursory manner, would be quite outside the scope of this work. We shall therefore look only at those points which will assist

[1] The 'First Cause' of philosophy is God in the language of religion.

[2] Literally, 'Disciplinary Science.' This name comes from the fact that the old philosophers used to teach this subdivision to their disciples in order to discipline their youthful minds before starting on the more conjectural subjects of Metaphysic and Physic. For every point in this subdivision is demonstrable by proof, and 'the mind of youth craveth absolute demonstration.'

[3] Metaphysic is also called 'the Higher Science' (ᶜIlm-i Aᶜla); Mathematic, 'the Intermediate Science' (ᶜIlm-i Evsat); Physic, 'the Lower Science' (ᶜIlm-i Esfel).

[4] It will be observed that there is no place for 'Logic' (ᶜIlm-i Mantiq) in this scheme: the reason is that Logic was regarded not as in itself a science, but as the instrument by the aid of which the sciences were to be investigated.

us in our study of the poets, passing by the others, which include the whole of the Practical branch and all the departments of Mathematic except Astronomy. [1]

All conceivable existence is either (1) 'Necessary' (Wájib-ul-Vujúd), or (2) 'Possible' or 'Contingent' (Mumkin-ul-Vujúd), or (3) 'Impossible' (Mumteni^{c}-ul-Vujúd); but as the third of these, an example of which would be a co-equal of the First Cause, cannot be, existence is actually limited to the Necessary and the Possible. The existence which is independent of another existence is Necessary; the existence which is dependent on another existence is Possible or Contingent (both terms are applied to the same existence). The only existence which is independent of another existence is that of the First Cause, so the First Cause is the only Necessarily Existent; the existence of every thing else is merely Contingent. The existence of the Contingent is the proof of the existence of the Necessary, since what is depended on must exist ere the thing that depends on it can exist.

Contingents, collectively considered, are called 'the Universe' (^{c}Álem); so the First Cause plus the Universe represents the sum of existent things.

Every Contingent is either dependent on the existence of another Contingent, or it is not. If it is not, it is called 'Substance' (Jevher); if it is, it is called 'Accident' (^{c}Araz). [2]

[1] The classical Turkish work on Practical Philosophy is the Akhláq-i ^{c}Alá'í. The author Qinali-záde ^{c}Alí, who died in 979 (1571-2), was the father of Qinali-záde Hasan, the compiler of a very important work on the lives of the Ottoman poets, to which we shall constantly refer in the progress of our History. The title Akhláq-i ^{c}Alá'í, which may be rendered by 'The Exalted Ethics,' contains an allusion to the name of the vezir ^{c}Alí Pasha to whom the book is dedicated. It was printed at Búláq in 1248 (1832-3).

[2] The 'Ten Categories' (Maqúlát-i ^{c}Ashere) are the highest classes to which Contingents may be referred. They are: 'Substance' (Jevher), 'Quantity' (Kem), 'Quality' (Keyf), 'Place' (Eyn), 'Time' (Meta), 'Relation' (Izáfet), 'Possession' (Mulk), 'Situation' (Waz^{c}), 'Activity' (Fa^{c}l), 'Passivity' (Infi^{c}ál).

The genesis of the Universe is on this wise: Without suffering any alteration or diminution thereby, the First Cause rays out from Its own fulness an image of Itself, the first of a series of emanations or projections in which the proportion of Real (i. e. Necessary) Being diminishes as they recede from the Centre. This first emanation is pure thought, and is called the 'First' or 'Universal Intelligence' (ʿAql-i Evvel, ʿAql-i Kull).[1] It has three sides or aspects: (1) the 'Divine' (Haqq), through virtue of which it knows the First Cause; (2) the 'Psychic' (Nefs), through virtue of which it knows itself; (3) the 'Dependent' (Muhtáj), through virtue of which it knows its dependence on its Lord.[2] From each of these three aspects of the First Intelligence there proceeds a different emanation, the law being that from one source but one thing can proceed, i. e. a thing cannot communicate to its own production anything other than itself. From the Divine aspect flows the 'Second Intelligence;' from the Psychic aspect, the 'First' or 'Universal Soul' (Nefs-i Evvel, Nefs-i Kull);[3] from the Dependent Aspect, the 'Sphere of Spheres' or 'Universal Body;' this last, as we shall see immediately, is the outermost of the nine concentric spheres or heavens that enclose the elemental world. From the three aspects of the Second Intelligence proceed in like manner the Third Intelligence, the Second Soul and the Sphere of the Fixed Stars. This process is continued till we reach the Tenth Intelligence, the Ninth Soul and the Sphere of the Moon, all produced from the Ninth Intelligence; so that there are

[1] This is the Nous of Plotinus and his successors, the Logos of Philo.

[2] These three aspects are sometimes described as (1) Vujúd or 'All-comprising Existence,' i. e. that existence which comprehends both the Necessary and the Contingent; (2) Vujúb or 'Necessary Existence;' (3) Imkán or 'Contingent Existence.'

[3] Often called, especially by Súfís and poets, the 'Cosmic Soul' or 'World-Soul' (Ján-i ʿÁlem, Ján-i Jihán). It is the Psyche of the Neo-Platonists.

in all Ten Intelligences, Nine Souls and Nine Spheres. The Tenth Intelligence bears the special name of the 'Active Intelligence' ('Aql-i Fa"ál), as it is sufficiently removed from the centre of pure spirit to be materialized to the point when it can act directly on the elemental world.

Interwoven with this doctrine of emanations is, as we have just seen, the Ptolemaic system of cosmography.[1] Around the central, stationary earth revolves a series of nine hollow concentric shells called Spheres or Heavens, arranged one within the other 'like the coats of an onion.' To each of the seven innermost of these is fastened one of the Seven Planets, which are thus carried round by the spheres in their revolution. These seven planetary spheres are in order, starting from the innermost: (1) that of the Moon, (2) that of Mercury, (3) that of Venus, (4) that of the Sun, (5) that of Mars, (6) that of Jupiter, (7) that of Saturn. Outside these is the Eighth Sphere, that of the Fixed Stars, outside which, and outermost of all, comes the Ninth Sphere, which is called the 'Sphere of Spheres' (Felek-ul-Eflák) as it encloses all the others, or the 'Most Great Sphere' (Cherkh-i A'zam) as it is the mightiest of all, or the 'Fleckless Sphere' (Cherkh-i Atles)[2] as, carrying no star, it is without spot or mark.[3]

[1] It is very necessary for us to have some acquaintance with this system, as it alone was recognised by the Turkish poets down to the rise of the New School, and allusions to it are innumerable. The Turks were not unacquainted with the other astronomic systems; both the Tychonic and the Copernican are described by Kátib Chelebi in the Jihán-Numá or 'Belvedere,' which he left unfinished at his death in 1068 (1657-8); but the poets, in their verses at any rate, preferred to adhere to the time-honoured system of their fathers.

[2] The word 'atles,' which properly means 'unfigured' i. e. 'unembroidered,' is used as the name for 'satin,' whence comes an infinity of equivoques.

[3] This, which is the Primum Mobile of the Middle Ages, is also called the 'Limiter of Directions' (Muhaddid-ul-Jihát), as beyond it the 'six directions' i. e. before, behind, right, left, above and below, have no existence; and the 'Universal Body' (Jism-i Kull), as it is the body which contains all other bodies.

The universe thus presents the appearance of a vast ball, the outside of which is formed by the convex surface of the Ninth Sphere. What, if anything, lies beyond this Sphere, whether there be 'vacuum' (khalá) or 'plenum' (melá) there, though often asked, is known to none.

Each of these Nine Spheres or Heavens has an Intelligence and a Soul as well as a body. [1] The Intelligence of the Sphere of Spheres is the Second Intelligence, and its Soul is the Universal Soul; the Intelligence of the Sphere of the Fixed Stars is the Third Intelligence, and its Soul is the Second Soul, and so on, the Intelligence of the Sphere of the Moon being the Tenth, and its Soul the Ninth.

The Nine Spheres revolve, at different velocities, round the earth. The eight inner have two motions, one from west to east, which is proper to them, and which is 'voluntary' (irádí) or 'natural' (tabíʿí), and one from east to west, which is forced on them by the Ninth Sphere, and which is called 'compulsory' (qasrí). [2] The Ninth Sphere has a swift motion from east to west, effecting its revolution once in twenty-four hours, and carrying with it all the inner spheres. [3]

[1] In theological language the Intelligences and Souls would be called Archangels.

[2] The motion of the inner spheres relative to that of the ninth is illustrated by the example of an ant creeping round the upper stone of a quern or hand-mill which is being turned in the opposite direction. As the ant, although it is borne round by the stone, still makes a little progress in the direction which itself desires, so the eight inner spheres, though carried round by the ninth, still progress slowly along their 'natural' course.

[3] From this theory of the revolutions of the spheres arose a fancy which plays a very prominent part in poetry. Astrology was universally accepted, and men believed that the planets, directly or indirectly, exercised a far-reaching influence on mundane affairs. The nature of this influence depended very largely on the position of the planets relative to one another. Now this relative position was changing every moment owing to the rotation of the spheres, the eight inner revolving slowly, as we have seen, in their natural course, while the ninth whirled them all round in the opposite direction once in every twenty-four hours. This idea led the poets to represent the Ninth

The Nine Spheres [1] are all transparent and therefore invisible; they and the stars they càrry consist of ether, a substance which has no movement other than spatial, [2] and no motion other than circular, but which diminishes in purity as it approaches the centre of the universe. They fit closely into one another, so that there is no empty space between the inner or concave surface of one and the outer or convex surface of that immediately within it.

Within the hollow of the Sphere of the Moon lies the elemental world. The basis of this is no longer ether, but 'Matter' (Heyúla), and immanent in Matter is 'Form' (Súret), without which its actualized existence is impossible. Form is in two degrees: 'Corporeal Form' (Súret-i Jismíye), and 'Specific Form' (Súret-i Nevʿíye). Matter, in combination with the first of these, produces 'Body in the Abstract' [3] (Jism-i Mutlaq); and this, in combination with the second, produces the 'Individual Body.' Matter may in this connection be compared to the human breath, and Corporeal Form to sound, then the human voice, which is the result of the combination of human breath and sound, will correspond to Body in the Abstract, which is the result of the combination

Sphere, the rapid motion of which occasions these sudden changes in the positions of the planets, as a kind of evil power; and they are never tired of railing against its malignity and the delight it takes in frustrating human hopes and plans through the influences of those ever-shifting aspects of the planets brought about by the ceaseless rush of its revolution.

[1] In order to account for the various movements of the planets the seven inner spheres were supposed to contain one or more 'subordinate spheres' (eflák-i juz'íye), such as the 'deferent' (hámil), the 'epicycle' (tedvír), and so on; but it is not necessary for the student of poetry to be acquainted with these details.

[2] Movement is of three kinds: 'Quantitative Movement,' i. e. increase and decrease, (hareket-i kemíye); 'Qualitative Movement,' i. e. alteration, (hareket-i keyfíye); and 'Spatial Movement,' i. e. locomotion, (hareket-i eyníye).

[3] 'Body' (jism) is defined as that which possesses length, breadth and depth, and is therefore divisible.

of Matter and Corporeal Form; in the same way, Specific Form will represent the power of the several letters, for this, in combination with sound, produces individual words, just as Specific Form, in combination with Body in the Abstract, produces individual bodies.

Matter is susceptible of every Form; it has been likened in this respect to wax, and Form to the impressions the wax can receive. The Form is continually changing; the Matter is always the same. Matter is the substratum of which every sublunary body consists. Form is what gives to every body its individuality. But while Matter is thus looked on as passive rather than active, it must yet be regarded as having some power of its own, as it is from it that arises the necessity which limits and holds back both man and nature in their efforts towards self-realisation, and as it is due to its resistance that the soul can ascend only by degrees from the lower to the higher stages. Matter is therefore generally considered as essentially evil.

The first manifestation of Specific Form is in the 'Four Elements:' 'Fire,' 'Air,' 'Water' and 'Earth.' The arrangement of the elemental world is, like that of the ethereal, a series of concentric, spherical layers. As Fire is the lightest and subtlest of the Four, its region is the highest, lying within and touching the concave surface of the Sphere of the Moon. In its pure state Fire is colourless and transparent, consequently the Sphere of Fire is invisible. Next comes the Sphere of Air,[1] that element being somewhat denser than Fire. Within this is the Sphere of Water, denser still; and within the Sphere of Water is the Sphere of Earth, densest of all things in existence. The Earth thus forms the

[1] The Sphere of Air is subdivided into three 'strata' (tabaqát). The Sphere of Fire and the highest stratum of the Sphere of Air, though by their own nature stationary, are carried round by the Sphere of the Moon in its revolution.

core of the universe, and the centre of the earth is the Centre of the Universe. The Sphere of Earth was originally entirely surrounded by the Sphere of Water; but owing to some reason — the explanations vary — the Water withdrew from the higher portions of the uneven surface of Earth and settled in the hollows, thus leaving certain parts of the surface of the Earth in contact with the concave surface of the Sphere of Air. [1]

The Four Elements are distinguished from one another by their 'Natures' (Tabáyiᶜ) or 'Qualities' (Keyfíyát). These are in each case twofold: Fire is dry and hot, Air is hot and moist, Water is moist and cold, Earth is cold and dry. The elements are continually passing into one another through the medium of that quality they possess in common; thus fire can pass into air through the medium of heat, air into water through the medium of moisture, and so on. In all those changes it is only the form that alters; the matter of which the elements (and therefore all sublunary bodies) are made never changes, however manifold and diverse be the forms manifested through it. This process of transmutation of the simple elements, which is called 'Generation and Corruption' (Kevn u Fesád), [2] is brought about by the in-

[1] The geographers divide the surface of the terrestrial globe into two parts: land and water. The land part they subdivide into halves by the equator. That to the south is reckoned uninhabitable through the greatness of the heat. That to the north alone is peopled and cultivated. This is called the 'Habitable Quarter' (Rubᶜ-i Meskún), and is divided into seven zones by as many imaginary lines drawn parallel to the equator, the space between the seventh and the north pole being reckoned uninhabitable through the greatness of the cold. The seven zones are famous as the 'Seven Climates,' and the countries and cities situated in each are carefully noted; but it is enough for us to know that the First Climate is that next to the equator, and the Seventh that farthest from it.

[2] In this phrase 'Corruption' means Matter's putting off a particular form, 'Generation' its assumption of another form. The one cannot occur without the other, and both are in ceaseless operation in the elemental world, the world of change.

fluences of the Seven Planets, [1] and results in the production of the three classes of compound bodies, namely, Minerals, Vegetables and Animals. The Seven Planets are therefore often called the 'Seven Sires' (Ábá-i Sebʿa); the Four Elements, the 'Four Mothers' (Ummehát-i Erbaʿa); and the three classes of compound bodies, the 'Threefold Offspring' (Mewálíd-i Seláse). The class of Animals reaches its goal in 'Man' (Insán).

This brings us to Psychology. There are three degrees of soul: the 'Soul Vegetable' (Nefs-i Nebátíye), the 'Soul Sensible' — lit. 'Soul Animal' — (Nefs-i Haywáníye), and the 'Soul Reasonable' (Nefs-i Nátiqa). [2] The first, which corresponds to what we should call the vital principle, is shared in common by plants, brutes and man; its functions are growth, nourishment and reproduction. The second, which represents the principle of sensation or perception, is confined to brutes and man; its functions are sensation and voluntary movement. The third, the principle of reason, belongs to man alone; and its function is reason. The individual human soul, in which all these combine, is thus threefold, but it is only the Reasonable element that survives death. Yet it is the same soul which having begun its terrestrial life in the mineral, pushes up, as swiftly as the opposition of matter will allow, through the plant and the brute to man, developing, as it ascends, its latent powers, till at last it is able to

[1] This was the opinion of the physicists; the metaphysicians held the Tenth or Active Intelligence to be the agent. See p. 43. Both views are recognised by the poets and Súfís.

[2] The theories here dealt with prevailed throughout Christendom as well as throughout Islam during the Middle Ages. They are expounded in English in the volume entitled 'Batman uppon Bartholome, his Booke "De Proprietatibus Rerum,"' London, 1582. This work, which is said to have been originally written in Latin about the middle of the thirteenth century by an English Franciscan friar named Bartholomew, is practically an encyclopædia of medieval science.

discard as now useless crutches those faculties by means of which it has progressed so far upon its journey.

The Soul Vegetable possesses four faculties called 'Powers' or 'Virtues.' These are: (1) the 'Virtue Nutritive' (Quvvet-i Ghádíya), by which the organism supplies the waste of the body; (2) the 'Virtue Augmentative' (Quvvet-i Námíye), by which up to a certain period of life the organism grows, i. e. increases in length, breadth and depth; (3) the 'Virtue Generative' (Quvvet-i Muvellide), by which the organism, through detaching a portion of itself, produces another similar individual; and (4) the 'Virtue Informative' (Quvvet-i Musavvira), by which the aforesaid detached portion, if it fall into a suitable place, is moulded into its proper form and fashioned into a similar individual. These four 'Virtues' or faculties are served by four others: (1) the 'Virtue Attractive' (Quvvet-i Jázibe), by which the organism draws to itself the material proper for its nourishment; (2) the 'Virtue Retentive' (Quvvet-i Másike), by which it retains the food in the proper place until digested; (3) the 'Virtue Digestive' (Quvvet-i Házime), by which it converts the food into matter proper for the reparation of the waste of the body; and (4) the 'Virtue Expulsive' (Quvvet-i Dáfi'a), by which it casts forth what is superfluous. [1]

The Soul Sensible has two faculties: the 'Virtue Motive' (Quvvet-i Muharrike), and the 'Virtue Apprehensive' (Quvvet-i Mudrike). The Virtue Motive is of two kinds: the 'Virtue Concupiscible' (Quvvet-i Shehvíye), by which the animal seeks to obtain what it takes to be good; and the 'Virtue Irascible' (Quvvet-i Ghazabíya), by which it seeks to shun what it

[1] Several of these medieval terms have been retained in the terminology of modern science, though the application, of course, is changed; thus the names Quvve-i Jázibe, Quvve-i Másike, Quvve-i Dáfi'a, are nowadays applied to the forces of Attraction, Cohesion and Repulsion, respectively.

takes to be evil. This Virtue Motive acts through the impulsion of the Virtue Apprehensive, which is served by the 'Five Outer' and the 'Five Inner Wits' or 'Senses.' The former are, of course, 'Touch,' 'Smell,' 'Taste,' 'Hearing' and 'Sight;' the latter are the 'Common Wit' or 'Sense' (Hiss-i Mushterik), the 'Fantasy' (Khayál), the 'Virtue Estimative' (Quvvet-i Wáhime), the 'Virtue Memorative' (Quvvet-i Háfiza) and the 'Virtue Ordinative' (Quvvet-i Mutasarrifa). The Common Sense is the recipient of all the perceptions conveyed from without by the five outer senses; it has been compared to a pond into which five streams flow. Its seat is in the front part of the foremost of the three brain-cells.[1] The Fantasy is the store-house of the perceptions received by the Common Sense; thus so long as an object is before us its image is reflected in the Common Sense, but as soon as it passes from before us its image passes from the Common Sense and is relegated to the Fantasy. The seat of the Fantasy is in the back part of the foremost brain-cell. The Virtue Estimative is that faculty which takes cognisance of moral qualities as manifested in individuals but not themselves perceptible by the outer senses, such as the affection of a friend, the hatred of an enemy; its seat is in the back part of the mid brain-cell. The Virtue Memorative is the store-house of impressions received through the Virtue Estimative; its seat is in the hind brain-cell. The Virtue Ordinative, whose seat is in the centre, in the front part of the mid brain-cell, takes impressions from both sides, and combines and separates these as it pleases. It is equivalent to what we call the imagination, and 'the fanciful inventions of the poets, such as silver cypresses and ruby mountains, are its work.'

[1] The old physiologists divided the brain into three compartments which they called 'cells' or 'dens.'

The Soul Reasonable is distinguished by two special faculties: the 'Virtue Speculative' (Quvvet-i ʿAlime), and the 'Virtue Practical' (Quvvet-i ʿAmile); by the first the man is able to understand 'Speculative Philosophy,' by the second he can act according to the teaching of 'Practical Philosophy.'

The Soul Reasonable alone can draw universal conclusions or form abstract conceptions. Thus an animal may be able to form an idea of love in connection with its master, but it cannot conceive love in the abstract apart from an individual.

The definition given of the Soul Reasonable is: A simple, incorporeal substance, directly [1] cognisant of intellectual conceptions, and working in the sensible body through the instrumentality of the faculties.

The proof that the Soul Reasonable is a substance, and not an accident, is that it is capable of receiving accidents, namely, mental or intellectual impressions; whereas it is an axiom that one accident cannot be the recipient of another accident. [2] The proof that it is incorporeal is: all substance is either corporeal or incorporeal; if it is perceptible by the outer senses, it is the former; if it is not, it is the latter: the soul is imperceptible by the outer senses, therefore it is incorporeal. The proof that it is simple, and not composite, i. e. that it is indivisible and indecomposable is: it is capable of knowing certain things, such as unity, which are beyond question simple: for as knowledge is the merging of the impression of the thing known in the essence of the knower, it follows that what can know the simple must itself be

[1] i. e. without the intervention of any instrument.

[2] The favourite example of substance and accident is body and colour. The existence of body, which is substance, is in no wise dependent on that of its colour; but the existence of colour, which is accident, is dependent on that of the body which bears the colour, and is inconceivable without it.

simple.[1] The proof that it is directly cognisant of intellectual conceptions is that it is cognisant of its own existence, for the intervention of an instrument between a thing and its own essence is impossible. And so philosophers say the knowing and the known and the knower are really one. That the soul is brought into contact with the physical world through the instrumentality of the senses is obvious and demands no proof.

The immortality of the soul is deduced from the fact that it is a substance, not an accident; for it is only accident and form that come and go, substance is eternal.

As Humanity is the crown of the animal kingdom, so is the 'Perfect Man' (Insán-i Kámil) the crown of Humanity. It is to this stage of the Perfect Man, who by contemplation and by virtue can enter into the pure thought of the First Intelligence, that all things consciously or unconsciously strive; for when the soul has reached this point it is ready to pass back into the bosom of that glorious Being whence it issued on its journey ages ago. This journey is called the 'Circle of Existence' (Deverán-i Vujúd). The spark of Divine Light or effluent Being descends through the Intelligences, the Souls, the Spheres and the Elements till it reaches Earth which is the lowest point on its downward course; and this is the 'Outward Track' (Taríq-i Mebde) or the 'Arc of Descent' (Qavs-i Nuzúl). The upward journey is then begun through the Mineral, the Vegetable, the Brute and Humanity till the stage of the Perfect Man is reached, when the Soul passes back into the embrace of the First Intelligence whence it set forth; and this is the 'Homeward Track' (Taríq-i Maʿád) or the 'Arc of Ascent' (Qavs-i ʿUrúj).

[1] As were it otherwise, were the knower (the soul) divisible and decomposable, that which has been merged in its essence (the concept of unity) must also be divisible and decomposable, which is inconceivable.

And when it is achieved the journey is accomplished.[1]

The scientific views at which we have just glanced were indeed accepted by the Súfís or Mystics; but these thinkers attached little importance to the physical world, such slight interest as it held for them lying almost wholly in the fact that it is a shadow of the supersensuous. It was the other side, the transcendental side, of Neo-Platonism that really possessed them; and to it they devoted practically their entire attention.[2] As we saw in the preceding chapter, the

[1] The Súfís, who were generally philosophers as well as mystics, often allude to the Circle of Existence. The Homeward Journey is referred to in the following beautiful passage which occurs in the seventeenth story of the third book of the Mesneví of Jelál-ud-Dín.

از جمادی مردم و نامی شدم * وز نما مردم بحیوان بر زدم
مردم از حیوانی و آدم شدم * پس چه ترسم که زمردن کم شدم
حملهٔ دیگر بمیرم از بشر * تا بر آرم از ملائک پا و سر
وز ملک هم بایدم جستن و جو * کل شی هالک الا وجهه
بار دیگر از ملک قربان شوم * آنچه اندر وهم ناید آن شوم
پس عدم کردم عدم چون ارغنون * گویدم کانا الیه راجعون

I died from the mineral and I became the plant;
I died from the plant and I arose the animal;
I died from the animal and I became the man.
Why then should I fear that in dying I become less?
Yet again shall I die from the man
That I may assume the form of the angels.
And even than the angel must I further win —
('All things perish except His Face!') *
Offered up once again from the angel, I shall become
That which entereth not the imagination, that shall I become!
Let me then become Non-existence; for Non-existence like the organ
Pealeth to me 'Verily unto Him do we return!' †

The same idea is expressed by the poet in one of his finest ghazels, the text and translation of which are given by Mr. R. A. Nicholson on pp. 46-9 of his admirable 'Selected Poems from the Dīvāni Shemsi Tabrīz.'

* Koran, xxviii, 88. † Koran, ii, 156.

[2] Many Orientalists consider Súfiism to be an offshoot from the Vedánta

system which bears their name presents two different aspects according to the prominence given to either of the two elements, mystic and philosophic, of which it is composed. We there gave our attention to the more mystic aspect, this being the immediate source of inspiration to the Ottoman poets; we shall here look for a little at the other side of Súfíism, that in which the philosophic element predominates; for although the traces of this are less evident upon the surface, its influence in poetry has been very great.

The dealings of the Súfís are with matters beyond the reach of conscious thought, in realms where reason, which the scientist philosophers profess to follow, cannot act as guide; and so to understand their philosophy it is necessary that we should first learn their doctrine of the soul, as this is the basis on which the whole structure rests.

There is an ancient tradition according to which the universe consists of eighteen thousand worlds;[1] and it may be that this tradition suggested the name of the 'Five Worlds' (ʿAwálim-i Khamsa) of the Súfís. These Five Worlds are not five different localities, but five different planes of

philosophy of India. My reasons for preferring to regard it as a development of Neo-Platonism are: Firstly, the practical identity of the two systems, except, of course, where coloured by the prevailing positive religion; Secondly, the circumstance that Súfíism as a system is first heard of in Syria, the country of Iamblichus, where Neo-Platonist ideas were widely spread; (Rábiʿa, the earliest of the lover-saints of Islam, died at Jerusalem in 135 (752-3); Abu-l-Háshim, who died in 150 (767), and was the first to bear the name of Súfí, was a Syrian Sheykh; it was about his time, and at Ramla in Syria, that the first Súfí convent was founded); Thirdly, the fact that the other side of Muhammedan philosophy is beyond question derived from the Neo-Platonist exponents of Aristotle.

[1] The following probably apocryphal Hadís is sometimes brought forward in support of this notion: إِنَّ لِلّٰهِ تَعَالَى ثَمَانِيَةَ عَشَرَ أَلْفَ عَالَمٍ وَ إِنَّ دُنْيَاكُمْ مِنْهَا عَالَمٌ وَاحِدٌ 'Verily, God hath eighteen thousand worlds; and, verily, your world is one of them.'

existence which loses in true Being as it descends; they are consequently often spoken of as the 'Five Planes' (Hazrát-i Khamsa). The accounts we have of them are naturally somewhat confused, and differ more or less in the different authorities; but essentially they are as follows: Above and beyond the universe, yet compassing all things, and the Source of all things, is the 'World of Godhead' (ᶜÁlem-i Láhút); of this nothing can be predicated, and It is not reckoned among the Five. The First of these is called the 'Plane of the Absolutely Invisible' (Hazret-i Ghayb-i Mutlaq) or the 'Plane of the Nebulosity' (Hazret-i ᶜAmá); and its world is the 'World of the Fixed Prototypes' (ᶜÁlem-i Aᶜyán-i Sábita),[1] that is to say, the existences that people it are the Fixed Prototypes.[2] The Second Plane is that of the 'Relatively Invisible' (Ghayb-i Muzáf), and its world is the 'World of the Intelligences and the Souls;'[3] these are sometimes called the 'Spirits of Might' (Erwáh-i Jeberútíye), and so this sphere of being is known also as the 'World of Might' (ᶜÁlem-i Jeberút).[4] The next Plane is called the 'World of Similitudes' (ᶜÁlem-i Misál), or the 'Angel World' (ᶜÁlem-i Melekút),[5] or sometimes the 'Intermediate World' (ᶜÁlem-i Berzakh), this last because it lies upon the border of the Fourth Plane. This is the 'Visible World' (ᶜÁlem-i Shehádet)

[1] It is impossible to translate the term Aᶜyán-i Sábita exactly: Sábita (from Subút) means 'potentially existent' as opposed to actually existent, as well as 'fixed' or 'permanent;' aᶜyán might be rendered by 'realities.' The Aᶜyán-i Sábita are closely akin to the Ideas of Plato.

[2] This sphere of existence is also called the 'World of Meanings' (ᶜÁlem-i Maᶜání), that is, of the true meanings which underlie names and the outward show of things.

[3] That is, of the Celestial or Spheral Intelligences and Souls.

[4] The terms Jeberút and Jeberútíye convey the idea of 'constraining,' as though the beings of this World exercised some constraining power over those below them.

[5] The term Melekút might also signify 'kingship' or 'dominion' or 'possession.'

which is often called the 'World of the Kingdom' (ᶜÁlem-i Mulk) i. e. the Physical World; it is the world in which we move, and is the antithesis of the 'Absolutely Invisible.'[1] The Fifth Plane is the 'World of Man' (ᶜÁlem-i Insán), which sums up and comprises all the others; for Man, as we shall see, is the Microcosm epitomising in himself the whole universe.

Through the Physical World is manifested the World of Similitudes (or the Angel World); through this, the World of the Intelligences and Souls; through this, the World of the Fixed Prototypes; through this, the World of the Divine Names or Attributes; and through this, the World of the Unity.

The Five Worlds are often regarded collectively as Three,[2] namely, 'the Invisible, the Intermediate and the Visible;' more often still as Two, 'the Visible and the Invisible' (ᶜÁlem-i Shehádet ve ᶜÁlem-i Ghayb) or 'the Physical and the Spiritual' (ᶜÁlem-i Mulk ve ᶜÁlem-i Melekút).[3]

The World of Similitudes is so called because in it exist, ready to be materialised, the forms which are to be actualised on the Physical Plane. The number of these which are so actualised at any given time is in proportion to the whole 'as a little ring in the midst of a vast desert.'

As the confines of this World of Similitudes touch those of the Visible World, passage between the two is possible; and this brings us to the Súfí theory of the soul.

The human soul is a spirit, and therefore, by virtue of its own nature, in reality a citizen of the Spirit World. Its

[1] It is also called the 'Sensible World' (ᶜÁlem-i Hissí), the 'World of Form' (ᶜÁlem-i Súret), the 'World of Generation and Corruption' (ᶜÁlem-i Kevn u Fesád), and so on.

[2] They are then sometimes arranged thus, beginning from the lowest: Mulk, Jeberút, Melekút, — an order which suggests the Christian phrase, 'the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory.'

[3] Poets and other writers continually allude to 'the Two Worlds.'

true home is there; and thence, for a certain reason, it descends into the Physical Plane, where, to enable it to act upon its surroundings, it is clothed in a physical body. So long as it is thus swathed in corporeity the soul ever, consciously or unconsciously, seeks to regain its proper world; it is drawn as by a spiritual gravitation towards its real home. But the body keeps it back; the phantasmagoria presented by the bodily senses seems the one reality, and this forms a veil which in the great majority of cases shuts out from it the view of its original dwelling-place. So engrossed is it by what is presented by the bodily faculties that it forgets the very existence of its own world; and failing to understand them, wrongly attributes certain inclinations that it has, in reality a heritage therefrom, to some material cause. It is only at rare intervals, when the body is asleep and all the avenues of the senses are closed, that such a soul can for a brief space, in a vision or a dream, look into its own world; but so dulled is it by oblivion and by the soil of earthly passions that it can receive only a faint impression of what is presented to it there, and thus when the sleeper awakens all is forgotten, or there remains but a vague indeterminable shadow. [1]

[1] The great majority of dreams have nothing to do with the Spirit World; they are but the result of forms which the senses have transmitted to the memory during the state of wakefulness. Such dreams, which are called by the Koranic term azghás-i ahlám i. e. 'tangled dreams,' are without significance. Those visions which are really received in the Spirit World are of two classes; the first and rarest are those which are so clear that they stand in no need of interpretation; the second and more usual are those perceptions which the percipient (the Soul Reasonable) transmits to the Imagination to be clothed in some analogous form; it is dreams of this class that call for an interpreter. True dreams may be distinguished from 'tangled dreams' by the quickness with which the sleeper awakens and by the profound, clear and lasting impression which the dream produces. A dream, the details of which have to be laboriously brought together by the memory, belongs to the category of the 'tangled.'

The power of passing from the Physical World into the Spiritual is potential in every soul, but it is actualised only in a few. In a very few of these, namely in the cases of the prophets and great saints, it is, by the special grace of God, so developed that even while the body is awake, the veil woven by the senses is from time to time withdrawn and the soul is for a moment brought face to face with the Spirit World, and there, where is neither space nor time, it beholds the Reality of all things, and hears the voices of the Heavenly Host (Mele-i A'la). It is thus those gifted ones receive their revelations; and it is to impressions so obtained that we owe such information as we have concerning the Five Worlds and other spiritual phenomena. [1] But we are explicitly told that such impressions cannot be adequately rendered in earthly language; they belong to a plane of existence the conditions of which lie outside human conception, and therefore to be conveyed at all, they have to be translated into some sort of allegory or metaphor which by analogy may suggest the inexpressible idea that lies beneath, but which must not be taken in its literal sense. This point is important as it underlies the whole Súfí terminology.

We now see the ground on which the Súfís base their transcendental doctrines; it is the experience of their own

[1] This is the Oriental theory of Revelation; and as all the Prophets have been Orientals, we may take it that the Oriental is best qualified to speak upon the subject.

Divination is upon the same lines; the soul of the diviner passes momentarily from the Physical to the Spiritual World; but in his case this passage has to be induced by external means. The soul of the prophet or saint is so pure and so little under the influence of the senses that it effects the passage without external aid, while the diviner is compelled to have recourse to his incantations, or whatever else he may use as medium, in order to abstract his soul from the sensible world. But these media, which are really foreign to the perceptive faculty, mingle with his perceptions, and consequently the impressions he receives are sometimes true and sometimes false.

souls in the Spirit World. But such experience, which is technically termed 'unveilment' (keshf) in allusion to the withdrawal of the veil interposed by sensual perception, is not the aim of the true Súfí; it comes, so to speak, fortuitously. His real goal is absorption in the Deity. The highest happiness of any being consists in the most perfect realisation of itself; the human soul realises itself most perfectly in union with the Divine Soul, so therein lies its supreme felicity. This union is achieved through the state called 'Ecstasy' (Hál), and when in Ecstasy the soul is transported to the Spirit World and there beholds the mysteries.

That in their endeavours to express these ineffable mysteries in earthly speech different seers should make use of different, even divergent, language, is inevitable. Thus some seek to explain the descent of the soul to the physical world by the Divine desire of self-manifestation, and teach that it is really God who looks out upon His own works through the eye of man;[1] others again, while admitting the ultimate identity of the soul with God, say that the soul has been sent down in order that it may perfect itself by experience of life on the physical plane, where the imperfections arising from the nature of matter offer opportunities for the development of noble qualities, opportunities necessarily lacking in a more perfect sphere; these teachers hold that according to the use the soul makes of such opportunities will be its position when it returns home. All agree in maintaining the pre-natal existence of the soul, and in declaring the physical world to be but the transient and distorted reflection of a far more glorious world, and in itself essentially unreal. They say that the love for whatever it may consider beautiful which is in every soul arises from the fact that in the Other World the soul gazed upon the Archetypal Beauty, and

[1] See pp. 19-22. This is the view generally expressed by the poets.

that the beautiful earthly object awakens a reminiscence of this. But it is only the enlightened who are conscious of this fact, and therefore their delight in beauty is far above that of the ignorant crowd who attribute the pleasure they feel to some lower, most often material, source.

As we have seen from their idea of the Five Worlds which become less subtle and more complex as they recede from the One, the Súfí conception of the universe is essentially the Alexandrian doctrine of Emanations. It is therefore natural that they too should often speak of the first and second hypostases as the Universal Intelligence and the Universal Soul, although this may be somewhat outside their special terminology.

The first point on which they insist is the absolute ineffableness of God whom, as already mentioned, they generally speak of as 'The Truth.' [1] He is beyond unity, beyond perfection, beyond even being; of Him nothing can be affirmed. In the words of an eminent Turkish Súfí, Sheykh ᶜAbdulláh of Bosnia: [2] 'The Truth, regarded from the side of the unconditionedness of His Essence and of the unformedness of His Ipseity and of His unparticularisedness, is, in His Essential Oneness and His Very Unity, above description and attribution and nomination and definition and predication. He may not be predicated of with any predication; He may not be described by any description; He may not

[1] A Muhammedan friend once suggested to me that 'The Fact' would be a better translation of this term, Haqq, than 'The Truth,' as conveying more forcibly the idea that God is the one and only Reality in existence. But while admitting the force of my friend's contention, I have preferred to retain 'The Truth,' as being, to my mind at least, less concrete.

[2] Sheykh ᶜAbdulláh-i Bosneví wrote an esteemed Turkish commentary on the celebrated Muhí-ud-Dín bin-ᶜArebí's famous work entitled Fusús-ul-Hikem 'The Gems of Philosophy.' Ibn-ᶜArebí died in 638 (1240); Sheykh ᶜAbdulláh in 1054 (1644-5). The passages translated are from the Introduction which the Sheykh has prefixed to his Commentary.

be named by any name; He may not be particularised by any definition. Nothing can be predicated of Him concerning either Unity or the necessity of His existence, or concerning any relationship of knowledge, whether of Himself or of others. He is above the multiplicity of the Attributes and the Names. While merged in Him, the Divine Names are He is He; not, They are He. So His Unity is one with Very Unity; it is not dependent on the opposition of multiplicity; its realisation in the soul and its impression in the mind of the thinker do not depend on the impression of its opposite. [1] Nay, it is existent through its own self. And when we speak of 'Unity' it is in order to indicate its aloofness and its glory; not to express the usual meaning of the word 'unity.' So The Truth, regarded from the side of His Very Unity, and considered apart from His manifestation through phenomena, is not to be understood or comprehended or conceived, and is not knowable or describable.'

The first particularisation (ta'ayyun) is in what is conventionally known as the Plane of Nebulosity; here the so-called 'Divine Names' (Esmá-i Iláhíye) become distinguishable. These Names, examples of which are 'Merciful,' 'Eternal,' 'Omniscient,' 'Almighty,' are symbols which point to God through one or other of His Attributes. [2] Hitherto these are merged in the Oneness, the 'Very Unity;' now they differentiate; and through their differentiation God becomes conscious of Himself. Here likewise come into individual potential being the Prototypes already mentioned, though their actualisation is in a lower plane.

[1] It is above the axiom that things are known through their opposites.

[2] The terms 'Names' (Esmá) and 'Attributes' (Sifát) are used synonymously in this connection. The former was suggested by the two following passages from the Koran: vii, 179. 'To God belong the most fair names; call ye then on Him thereby.' and xx, 7. 'God, there is no God but He! His are the most fair names.'

So the descent is continued with ever increasing differentiation and complexity through the several planes till we reach the physical. But this sequence is not a sequence in time; for time does not come into existence till we touch the phenomenal plane: it is a sequence in causation. Sequence in causation is illustrated by an essentially luminous body and the light it throws out; such light being subsequent to the luminous body in causation, as until the latter exists, the light cannot; but not being subsequent to it in time, as it is impossible for an essentially luminous body to have existed a single moment without giving off light. [1]

The universe is summed up in Man who is its central point. Standing on the border-line between the spiritual and the physical, on the one side he joins hands with the angels, while on the other he is related to the brutes and the material world. Every other being in the universe reflects one or other of the Divine Attributes; Man reflects the whole. As Sheykh 'Abdulláh says: 'The universe is the aggregate of the individual objects through which are manifested the Divine Names; but as it was incapable of receiving the form of the Divine Totality, and as the manifesting of the manifestation of universality was not obtainable therethrough, God created Man, who is its soul, after the Divine image; so Man is the theatre of the Divine Names and the meeting-point of the Divine Attributes.' Man therefore gathers up in himself the individual reflections of the Divine Attributes elsewhere scattered singly through the universe, and at the same time he reflects the union of these, and in this way he is the image of God. So man is justly called the 'Microscosm' ('Álem-i Sughra) or 'Lesser World,' as being the sum and epitome of the 'Macrocosm' ('Álem-i Kubra) or

[1] See Mr. Browne's 'Year amongst the Persians,' p. 137.

'Greater World' outside. [1] Moreover, as in the heart of Man are reflected all the Attributes of God, it is held that the way to the knowledge of God is through the knowledge of Man's own heart. This doctrine is insisted upon with the greatest earnestness, and not one of the many aphorisms of the Súfís is more constantly quoted than these famous words: 'Whoso knoweth himself knoweth his Lord.' [2]

Absorption in the Deity, the merging of the individual soul of the saint in the Universal Soul of God, is the ultimate aim of Súfíism. This blissful state, which in the present life is possible only from time to time, and which is not to be evoked at will, is attainable by the saints alone, and the whole Súfí life consists in training the soul to be capable of such attainment. This training is generally begun by the aspirant becoming the disciple of some Súfí sage in whose teaching he must place the most absolute confidence. Asceticism and retirement from society are generally recommended; the former, because it tends to dull the animal appetites (for in proportion as these are dulled the windows of the soul are opened); the latter, because by shutting out the great sources of distraction, it renders self-concentration easier for the soul. But the all-important factor in this work is Love, a Love which, as we have already seen, rises from the seen and temporal to the Unseen and Eternal. It is by this all-constraining Love that the soul is wrapt in the utter self-oblivion of ecstasy and borne aloft into the great heart of Being. This is the feature of Súfíism which the poets seized upon, and which they elaborated into the religious

[1] Some writers call man the macrocosm, and the outer world the microcosm, man being in reality the greater of the two.

[2] مَنْ عَرَفَ نَفْسَهُ عَرَفَ رَبَّهُ. This speech, which is attributed to ʿAlí, the Prophet's son-in-law, will remind the reader of the equally famous aphorism of Thales: Know thyself!

philosophy of Love which has been sketched on a previous page. [1]

There is a matter calling for some attention in connection with this love-philosophy, in which the Orientals, by closely following their Grecian teachers, took up a position which is directly opposed to modern ideas. They held that the most fitting object of the human love which is to lead to the Divine is a youth, not a woman. Love for a youth, they maintained, is the only form of love worthy of the noble soul; for it alone can bring the Lover to that divestment of selfism which is the aim, as it is the only form of love which can be absolutely free from selfish desire. This, which is 'Platonic Love' in the true sense of that phrase, seems to entail a corresponding depreciation of woman; at least, we find that in proportion as it is current in a community, a tone of misogyny prevails in literature. [2] The idea of 'masculine love,' as the Greeks called it, was by them handed on with the other details of their philosophy to the Muhammedans. It consequently forms part and parcel of the literary outfit borrowed from the Persians by the Turks, and the traces of it are visible all through Turkish literature till we come to the Modern School. That with the Turks, at any rate, this fashion was for the most part merely a literary convention is shown by its absence from the national

[1] See pp. 20-2. This insistence upon Love as the chief agent in bringing the soul into the knowledge of God, and the prominence given to ecstasy as the state in which the soul is for the time being united with God, are among the clearest indications that the roots of Súfiism should be sought in Neo-Platonism rather than in the Vedánta philosophy. Love and ecstasy, as is well known, form essential elements of the Greek system, while they are entirely absent from the Indian, the rigorous logic of which allows no room for raptures or for passionate love of the Deity.

[2] The reader who desires to see how this form of love affected Greek literature is referred to an interesting volume entitled 'Antimachus of Colophon and the Position of Women in Greek Poetry,' by E. F. M. Benecke (Swan Sonnenschein & Co), where the subject is ably and fully discussed.

ballads, in which is heard the true voice of the people, by the struggle between it and love for woman even in the literary poetry, and by its final and decisive defeat.

Its prevalence, however, has created a considerable difficulty for the translator of the older poetry. The Turkish language, like the Persian, knows no distinctions of gender; and as the poets describe and address a beautiful maiden and a beautiful youth in identical terms, it is generally impossible, without some external clue, which is rarely forthcoming, to determine with certainty which of these was present in the writer's mind. Whether then shall we translate by 'he' or 'she'? From the unvarying sameness of their descriptions and the conventionality and constancy of the type, it is evident that the poets were for the most part concerned less with doing honour to any individual fair one than in offering their homage to abstract or ideal Beauty. We intuitively conceive of ideal Beauty under a feminine form; any other conception would be for us forced and unnatural. Consequently, by rendering their verses as though the earthly vision that inspired them were feminine, we shall perhaps come closer to and more faithfully represent the spirit of these poets, even if at times we be farther from the letter.

The Súfí teachers have reduced their system to a science which bristles with a complicated and generally obscure terminology. Into this it is unnecessary we should enter, as it has little direct bearing upon poetry. The poet who is imbued, as most poets are, with the Súfiistic mysticism, pays but scant heed to these technicalities. Unless he be himself a teacher of the Way, he leaves such details to the Schools, and lets his heart be wholly filled by the sublime conceptions of all-embracing Unity and all-conquering Love which form the real basis whereon all the rest is built.

Underlying all action, all existence, in the universe, such

a poet sees the Divine energy, of which all action and all existence is merely a manifestation. Reason, he knows, cannot transcend phenomena; and so, driven to pierce through to what lies beyond, he is fain to cast reason aside and lay bare the heart to receive that inward light by which alone man can behold The Truth. For the eye of reason before the Divine Light is like the human eye before the sun, it is blinded by excess of brightness, it loses itself in that 'dazzling darkness.' [1] When reason is thus burned up by the proximity of the Divine Light, the radiance of Illumination streams into the soul, and the poet sees how the whole phenomenal universe is an illusion, in itself non-existent. He sees how The Truth is the one source of all existence, diffused throughout the universe through emanation after emanation; how the Primal Intelligence, itself rayed out from the One, rays out in turn the Primal Soul; how the Divine Names cast their light upon the darkness of not-being, each separate atom of which mirror-like reflects one. He sees how the Awful Attributes of The Truth are reflected in the existence of hell and the devils, and how the Beautiful Attributes are reflected in that of Paradise and the angels. [2] He further sees how Man reflects all the Attributes, Awful and Beautiful alike, and is thus the Microcosm, summing up the universe in himself. He thus sees how it is The Truth alone that is acting through all things, and moreover how this action is a never-ceasing, never-pausing process, every non-existent

[1] Núr-i Siyáh, literally 'Black Light,' i. e. 'Dazzling Darkness,' is one of those Súfí phrases often used by the poets, — though sometimes in senses far enough from the original.

[2] The Divine Names or Attributes are often divided into those of 'Awfulness' (Jelál) and those of 'Beauty' (Jemál). The former are those pointing to the more terrible aspects of the Divine Nature, such as 'the Avenger,' 'the Destroyer,' etc.; the latter to the gentler, as 'the Merciful,' 'the Forgiver,' etc. Some say the Awful Attributes are the negative, such as 'the Unsleeping,' 'the Undying;' and the Beautiful the positive, such as 'the Holy,' 'the Just.'

atom being each instant clothed with a fresh phenomenal efflux radiated from the Source of existence and being again stripped of it, so that the whole contingent universe is momentarily being annihilated and re-created, though the successive acts of destruction and renewal follow one another in such swift succession that they are wholly imperceptible, and all appears as one uninterrupted line, [1] even as an unbroken circle of fire is seen if a single spark be whirled quickly round. [2] But the poet may not rest content with the mere perception of these high mysteries; indeed that very Love which has revealed them to him impels him to seek reunion with The Truth. How could he who sees how every effluent spark of Being is straining to return to its Source do other than strive with his whole heart and soul to attain that blessed consummation?

Such is the philosophic Súfíism of the poets.

From those diverse elements, theological, philosophic and mystic, was formed the religious and intellectual life of old Turkey. With the poets mysticism usually predominated; but they made as free use of the opinions and phraseology of the religious and the philosophers as they did of those

[1] This idea of the continual destruction and re-creation of the universe, which is often referred to by the poets, appears to be borrowed from one of the doctrines of the Mutekellimín or Scholastics. These doctors seem to have taken up the atomistic theory of Democritus, which they manipulated to suit their own purposes. They contended that God created the atoms; that the universe results from the 'accidents' these receive; that the accidents are the immediate creation of God; that no accident can last longer than one atom of time; and consequently that the universe is maintained in existence by a continuous series of distinct creative acts. Their name for the atom is Jevher-i Ferd, 'isolated substance,' or 'monad.'

[2] The Shu'le-i Jevwále or 'Whirling Spark' is often alluded to. A spark attached to a string and whirled quickly round appears to trace a complete circle of fire. While the spark is in reality every moment in a different spot, its motion is so rapid that the line of fire it presents appears continuous.

of the Súfís. Their verses therefore present ideas belonging to each of the three groups, and these are introduced side by side without any attempt at reconciliation. It follows that we must not take every statement and every allusion that we find in a poem as indicative of the real belief or opinion of the poet. A man who accepts the Ptolemaic system cannot possibly believe that the earth is supported by a bull that stands upon a fish; yet we sometimes find the same poet in the same poem referring to both conceptions. But such phenomena are common to all literatures. A poet takes ideas which are current among his people, whether such ideas be religious or scientific, mythological or fabulous, and introduces them in his verses, sometimes with the object of strengthening his statements by the citation of an authority popularly held Divine, sometimes with that of illustrating and illumining his teaching by referring to some fable or some theory familiar to all, and sometimes with no other than the purely decorative purpose of adding vivacity or brilliance to his lines by allusions fraught with a wealth of associations.

There were, however, it should be said, certain writers who made some attempt to harmonise the opposing systems. Those men proceeded on the lines that the ʿArsh and Kursí of the theologians represent the Ninth and Eighth Spheres of the philosophers; that the Light of Muhammed is merely another name for the First Intelligence; and so forth. In so far as these terms came to be used synonymously such would-be peace-makers were practically right; but in their origin those and similar conceptions were unconnected, and the associations attached to them remained distinct throughout.

It is perhaps unnecessary to add that the preceding sketch in no wise represents the culture of modern Turkey. There may still be some ignorant peasants who believe in Mount

Qáf and the Seven Seas; Súfíism or some kindred form of mysticism must always remain, for such is the necessary attitude of certain temperaments, to be found everywhere, though more common in the East; but the medieval philosophy which undertakes to explain all things in heaven and earth has passed away. The astronomy and physiology taught in Turkish schools to-day are the same as those we teach in England: the cosmography of Ptolemy and the psychology of Aristotle are now relegated to the study of the antiquary or historian.

CHAPTER III.

VERSE-FORMS, PROSODY AND RHETORIC.

In this chapter we shall consider the mechanism of the poetic system which the Turks borrowed from the Persians, looking first at the verse-forms, then glancing briefly at the prosody and at some of the more usual of the rhetorical figures.

Here the Turks were borrowing what was itself a loan, as almost every detail connected with the structure of Persian verse had been adopted by the Persians from the Arabs. To this Persianised-Arab system the Ottomans added, about the close of the seventeenth century when the national spirit began to stir in literature, a new and very simple verse-form modelled on their own popular ballads; and the system, thus reinforced, remained in exclusive use down to the year 1879, when the great reformer Hámid Bey introduced into Turkish poetry certain Western verse-forms, with a result that has proved revolutionary.

Although no distinctive trace of it is left in full-fledged Ottoman poetry, it will be interesting and useful if we try in the first place to get some slight idea of what old Turkish poetry was like before Persian influence had swamped or wiped out every genuine native element. To help us here we have three books, all written in Central Asia, and all considerably earlier than the commencement of the fourteenth

century when Ottoman, or rather West-Turkish, poetry begins. The oldest of these is the Qudatqu Bilik or 'The Auspicious Knowledge.' This, which claims to be the first book ever written in the Turkish tongue, was finished in Kashghar in A. H. 462 (A. D. 1069-70). It is in the Uyghur dialect of Turkish, and is the work of a certain Yúsuf who was Kháss Hájib or Privy Councillor to Boqra Khan, the King of those regions. In purpose this old book is ethical; it discusses, chiefly in the form of conversations between a fictitious King, his Vezir, and the Vezir's son and brother, the moral and social questions which weighed most with the Turks of those far-off times. As to external form, it is written in what the Persians and Ottomans would call Mesneví verse, that is, in rhyming couplets. The lines are uniformly eleven-syllabled, and the metre, according to Veled Chelebi — a modern Ottoman scholar of whom more anon, — is approximate to that of the Sháh-Náme of the Persian poet Firdausí. This last point is, however, difficult to determine, as the true Turkish metres — in one of which the Qudatqu Bilik is written — are syllabic, not quantitative like the Persian, and are sometimes susceptible of being read in more ways than one. [1]

The second of the old books referred to is the Díwán-i Hikmet or 'Philosophic Poems' of Khoja Ahmed-i Yeseví. This is some fifty years [2] later than the Qudatqu Bilik, and

[1] The Qudatqu Bilik has been published along with a German translation and an interesting and valuable Introduction by Professor Vámbéry: Uigurische Sprachmonumente und das Kudatku Bilik, von Hermann Vámbéry, Innsbruck, 1870.

[2] Veled Chelebi says it was written in A. H. 500 (A. D. 1106-7), but perhaps the true date is somewhat later. Khoja Ahmed-i Yeseví, i. e. Khoja Ahmed of Yesi (in Turkistán), was the most famous of the early Turkish Sheykhs. According to a Persian work entitled Khazínet-ul-Asfiyá or 'The Treasury of the Pure,' by one Ghulám Muhammed, Khoja Ahmed died in his native town of Yesi in A. H. 562 (A. D. 1166-7).

is in the Uzbek or Jaghatay dialect. Judging from a statement at the beginning of the first poem, the Díwán in our hands is the second volume of the author's works; the first seems to have disappeared. The book which we have consists of a collection of short poems wholly on mystic subjects. These poems vary somewhat in form, the norm being a succession of four-lined stanzas, the first three lines of each of which rhyme together, but take a new rhyme with each stanza, while the fourth lines are either identical throughout or, if varied, keep up the same rhyme. This rhyme-arrangement — a monorhyme with a thrice-repeated internal sub-rhyme — seems to have been very popular with the Turks. It is not confined to stanzaic verse; sometimes it appears in the couplet, the sub-rhyme being in this case repeated in the middle and at the end of the first line and in the middle of the second, while the monorhyme occurs once, at the end of every second line. It so happens that this arrangement of rhyme in connection with both stanza and couplet is known in Persian too; when it is in connection with the stanza, the form of verse is called Murebba[c], when with the couplet, it is said to be Musemmat.[1] Yeseví's metres are all genuine Turkish; but although the principle on which they are founded — a principle in true harmony with the genius of the language — is quite other than that of the Persian, an effect very similar to that of the Persian metres is often produced through the number of syllables being in many cases the same, while the fall of the accent replaces in a measure the quantity of the feet.

The third of our triad of ancient books is a poem on the scriptural romance of Joseph and Zelíkhá written, probably in Bokhara, by one ᶜAlí, and finished on the 30th. of Rejeb 630 (12th. May, 1233). This poem is composed in four-lined

[1] Some call it Musejjaᶜ.

stanzas of the form just described, that is, the first three lines in each rhyme with one another, while the fourth lines rhyme, or rather, are supposed to rhyme, together throughout. What actually happens in these fourth lines is that each ends in the same word, in what, as we shall learn, the Persians and Ottomans call a Redíf, before which the true rhyme-word ought to come; in ʿAlí's poem these penultimate words do as a rule (but not always) rhyme more or less perfectly. The metre, while certainly not quantitative, is not strictly syllabic, as the number of syllables to the line fluctuates between eleven and twelve; it is probable that accent played a considerable part here. [1]

From what has been said it will be seen that except in the matter of its prosody, which is based on an entirely different principle, native Turkish poetry, as represented by the three old books at which we have glanced, had much in common with Persian. Its chief verse-forms were in use among those of the more cultured system; and the lilt of its verse, though reached by another road, was not very different. That this should be so is natural enough considering that not only had the Turks and Persians been in contact for ages, but that for some time they had been brought yet closer by belief in a common faith. The way was therefore paved for the adoption of the Persian system by the Turks; and it was almost without an effort that the native system glided into the foreign. So far as West-Turkish poetry is concerned, the only struggle was between the two principles of prosody, the syllabic and the quantitative; for the first hundred years they were used together indiscriminately, till about the beginning of the fifteenth century the former

[1] A description of ʿAlí's poem, with a number of extracts, is given by Th. Houtsma in the 34th. Vol. (that for 1889) of the Journal of the German Oriental Society.

disappeared, leaving the Persian in undisputed possession.

One consequence of the acceptance by the Ottomans of the Perso-Arab poetic system is that almost all the technical terms used in Turkish in connection with the art or science, the names of the verse-forms, metres, feet, rhetorical figures and so on, are Arabic. In that language these are all significant words, describing, most often figuratively, that structure or peculiarity to which they are applied; but the Turks, in whose language few of them have any self-evident meaning, employ them as purely technical terms, generally without regard to their original signification.

Like all else connected with Persian and Ottoman poetry, the outward form is regulated by hard and fast rules which admit of no relaxation. Thus there are eighteen distinct verse-forms, each more or less appropriated to a certain class of subject; these the poet is bound to employ, making his choice according to his matter; he is in no wise at liberty to invent new combinations, and, indeed, no writer of the Old School ever attempted such a thing. Similarly, there is a limited number of metres; but as almost all of these are susceptible of several modifications, the total number of available varieties is pretty considerable. Each of these metres is divided into a definite number of feet, which, in their turn, are subdivided into a determined number of long and short or, as the Orientals call them, heavy and light syllables, following one another in a particular order which may not be altered. Some of these metres are generally used with one verse-form, some with another.

Let us look first at the Verse-forms which, as we have seen, are eighteen in number.

It is chiefly in the arrangement of the rhyme that these

verse-forms differ from one another, and so a few preliminary words on the nature of Ottoman rhyme will be appropriate here. As given by the Oriental rhetoricians, the rules in connection with this are very technical and extremely elaborate, but with only one exception they work out into practical identity with those that regulate rhyme in our own poetry. [1] When it extends beyond a single couplet Ottoman poetry is always rhymed, blank verse being unknown.

In addition to the rhyme we have very frequently what is called a Redíf (which in Arabic means 'Pillion-rider'); that is, one or more words, always the same, added to the end of every line that has the same rhyme, throughout an entire poem; which word or words, though counting in the scansion, are not regarded as the rhyme, the true rhyme in every case being found immediately before. The lines:

'There shone such a truth about thee,
'I did not dare to doubt thee,'

afford an English example; the word 'thee' being here a Redíf, while 'about' and 'doubt' form the true rhyme. But while in English we very seldom find a Redíf consisting of more than one word, a Persian or Ottoman Redíf may consist of every word in the line except the first, there being

[1] The exception referred to occurs in what is technically called Mu'esses Rhyme. Here the rhyme-letter (technically named the Revíʻ) is preceded by a short vowel (technically named the Tevjíh), which again is preceded by a consonant (technically named the Dakhíl), which in its turn is preceded by a long vowel (technically named the Te'sís). Now while in such rhyme the Revíʻ, the Tevjíh and the Te'sís must be the same, the Dakhíl need not be the same; thus the words Jázib, Kátib, Tálib are all good rhymes in Persian and Turkish. Such rhymes would be paralleled in English by 'baker,' 'hater,' 'paler,' words which we should regard as merely assonant, not as really rhyming. When the Dakhíl also is made the same, as in the words Jázib and Kázib, Kátib and Rátib, Tálib and Ghálib, the resultant rhyme is reckoned by the Easterns as a rhetorical embellishment, and classed as a variety of the figure called Iltizám or 'Supererogation.' With this exception the principle of Perso-Turkish rhyme is virtually the same as that of English.

of course always one word to form the rhyme. The Redíf does not form part of the original Arab system; it was grafted on to this by the Persians when adapting it to their own poetry. It is, however, probable that the Redíf was a feature of ancient Turkish poetry also, as it is of frequent occurrence in so early and so thoroughly Turkish a work as the Díwán-i Hikmet of Ahmed-i Yeseví, and runs right through ʿAlí's Joseph and Zelíkhá. It used to be constantly employed by the Ottoman poets, but it has somewhat lost ground of late years, as it tends to hamper freedom of expression, and moreover is not a characteristic of French poetry.

The Perso-Arab poetic system has two distinct rhyme-schemes, the one an invention of the Persians, the other the original Arabian plan. We shall begin with the first, as it is already familiar to us in our own literature, and as only one verse-form derives from it.

The distinctive feature of the Persian scheme is that throughout an entire poem the two hemistichs of each couplet rhyme with one another and without reference to the rhyme of any other couplet whatever, care only being taken that the same rhyme-sound does not immediately follow or precede, in other words, that two couplets having the same rhyme are not placed in juxtaposition. This system is simple in the extreme, and corresponds exactly to that observed in Pope's heroic couplets and countless other English poems.

I. Mesneví, or 'Double-Rhyme,' is the name given to a poem written in these rhyming couplets. Each of these couplets must be complete in itself; there must be nothing of what the French call 'enjambement,' that is, there must be no overflow of words into the couplet following. On account of the unlimited freedom in choice of rhyme which it affords,

this verse-form is generally adopted for long poems, the Arabian or monorhyme system being preferred for shorter pieces. All the metrical romances, for instance, many of which extend to several thousand couplets, are Mesnevís. The rhyming chronicles and lengthy mystic, didactic and ethical poems are likewise composed in this form. It is the rule that a long Mesneví, forming a complete book in itself, should open with a canto to the praise of God; this should be followed by one in honour of the Prophet, whose Miʿráj or 'Ascension' is very often celebrated in another. The next canto is generally a panegyric on the great man (usually the reigning Sultan) to whom the work is dedicated. This again is most often followed by a division bearing some such heading as 'The Reason of the Writing of the Book,' in which the poet narrates the circumstances that induced him to begin his work, generally the solicitations of some friend. After all this, which forms as it were the prologue, comes the story itself, or whatever else may be the subject of the work, divided as a rule into a number of books or sections, which are subdivided into a series of cantos. Each of these cantos is headed by a rubric, very often in the Persian language, setting forth the matter treated. The work is properly brought to a close by an epilogue, in which the date of composition is frequently mentioned. It was not unusual in early times for a poet to write a series of five such Mesnevís; in this case the series was called a Khamsa or 'Quintet.' When the subject of the Mesneví is a romance the poet often introduces during the course of the story a number of the little odes known as ghazels, placing these in the mouths of his characters in critical moments or when their feelings are highly strung. Long Mesnevís, running into thousands of couplets, are characteristic of the First and Second Periods, the subjects being generally mystic or religious in the former

of these, mystic-romantic in the latter. By the beginning of the Third Period these lengthy poems began to pass out of fashion, and comparatively few Mesnevís of any great length were written after its close. The form did not lose in popularity, but was employed for shorter poems, sometimes religious, sometimes didactic, but most frequently narrative or descriptive. Indeed, the Mesneví has at all times been the favourite verse-form for narrative poetry of every kind. Finally, its simplicity recommends it to the modern writers, with whom it is in much favour for short occasional poems.

As we have seen, the Qudatqu Bilik, the oldest Turkish book known, is written throughout in rhyming couplets; hence it is probable that Mesneví verse formed part of the original Turkish material and is therefore, so far as Ottoman poetry is concerned, rather a survival from the native system than a loan from outside.

Turning now to the Arabian system; we find that the distinctive characteristic here is the monorhyme; that is, that a single rhyme runs throughout the entire poem, no matter how long this be. In poems written on this principle the first lines of the several couplets generally remain unrhymed, while all the second lines rhyme together; in some cases, however, the first line of the opening couplet — i. e. the first line of the poem — rhymes with its own second line and consequently with that of each succeeding couplet. There are seventeen verse-forms constructed upon this plan, which was much more popular than the Persian, almost all the shorter pieces, and these form by far the larger portion of Ottoman poetry, having been written in accordance with it up to the rise of the Modern School. Let us now look at these seventeen verse-forms.

The unit upon which the Arabian scheme is built is the Misra^{c} (or Misrá^{c}), which we may translate as 'Hemistich.' This is a single line of verse written in one of the established metres, which, if placed beside another line in the same metre, would form a distich or couplet.

II. When a Misra^{c} does not form one of the members of a couplet, but is a unit complete in itself, having no connection with any other versified writing, it is called a Misra^{c}-i Ázáde or 'Independent Hemistich.'

III. The Bêyt, usually translated as 'Couplet' or 'Distich,' consists of two misra^{c}s in the same metre, which misra^{c}s may or may not rhyme together.

The Beyt, whether rhymed or unrhymed, may be either one out of several couplets which together form a poem, or it may, like the Independent Hemistich, be a separate unit.

When the two hemistichs rhyme, the Beyt is said to be Musarra^{c} or 'Rhymed.' This term is further applied — as descriptive of the rhyme-scheme — to any poem consisting of a succession of such couplets; so that in a piece of verse rhymed in Musarra^{c} fashion all the hemistichs will rhyme together.

When a Rhymed Beyt forms the opening couplet of a poem in monorhyme (especially of a ghazel or qasída) it is called a Matla^{c}, a word which literally means the 'Orient' or 'Rising-point' of a heavenly body. Such is the correct use of the term Matla^{c}; but the word is often loosely applied to an Independent Beyt when the two lines rhyme together.

An Independent Bêyt the two lines of which do not rhyme together is called a Ferd, or, more usually, a Mufred, both of which words mean 'Unit.' But these terms likewise are

often loosely employed, being frequently used to designate any Independent Beyt whether unrhymed or rhymed.

IV. The Ghazel: This, which is the most typically Oriental of all the verse-forms alike in the careful elaboration of its detail and in its characteristic want of homogeneity, is, or at least was till within recent years, the first favorite of the Ottoman poets. It is a short poem of not fewer than four and not more than fifteen couplets. Such at any rate is the theoretical limit, but Ghazels containing a much larger number of couplets may occasionally be met with; this, however, is exceptional, from five to ten being the average number. The first couplet of a Ghazel is, as we have seen, called the Matla^{c}, and is invariably musarra^{c}, the two hemistichs always rhyming together. All the succeeding couplets are non-musarra^{c}; that is, all their second lines rhyme together and with the Matla^{c}, while their first lines do not rhyme at all. If we employ the alphabetical notation usually adopted when dealing with rhyme-sequences, we get the following for a Ghazel of six couplets: A. A: B. A: C. A: D. A: E. A: F. A. The last couplet of a Ghazel has the special name of Maqta^{c} or 'Point of Section;' and in this the poet introduces his name, thus as it were affixing his signature to the little work. This custom of introducing the name towards the end of a poem is not peculiar to the Ghazel, but is common to all the verse-forms of more than two couplets deriving from the Arabian rhyme-system. Occasionally, but not often, a poet takes one of the lines, it may be the first or it may be the second, of the Matla^{c}, and repeats it as the rhyming-line of the Maqta^{c}, that is, as the last line of the Ghazel. This operation, which is called Redd-i Matla^{c} or 'Return of the Matla^{c},' has sometimes a very pleasing effect, when the line repeated is pretty or striking and falls naturally and aptly

into its place in either couplet. The second couplet of a Ghazel, that immediately following the Matla^c, is technically called the Husn-i Matla^c or 'Beauty of the Matla^c,' and it was a practice among the old poets to endeavour to make it more beautiful or more ingenious than the Matla^c itself. Just as the couplet immediately below the Matla^c is called the Husn-i Matla^c, that immediately above the Maqta^c is called the Husn-i Maqta^c; and just as the poet was supposed to give the former a peculiar excellence, he was held to make the latter likewise a verse of more than usual merit. Thus the poet would choose the best of the five couplets that would remain after appropriating the Matla^c, Husn-i Matla^c and Maqta^c of a Ghazel of eight distichs, and would place it immediately above the Maqta^c, thus making it into the Husn-i Maqta^c. Of course the judgment of the poet would not always be that of others, so the critics call what they take to be the best couplet of a Ghazel, whatever its position in the poem, the Sháh-Beyt (or Sheh-Beyt), that is, 'Couplet-Royal,' or sometimes, the Beyt-ul-Ghazel (or Beyt-i Ghazel), that is 'Couplet of the Ghazel.' In point of style the poem should be faultless; all imperfect rhymes, uncouth words and questionable expressions must be carefully avoided, and the same rhyme-word ought not to be repeated. It is the most elegant and highly finished of all the old poetic forms, and it is in it that the Ottoman poets have the best opportunity for displaying their exquisite skill as stylists. Hence perhaps the extraordinary popularity of the form; the number of Ghazels in the language is probably greater than that of all the other poems put together. Love in all its manifold phases — the charms of the beloved, the rapture caused by her presence, the anguish born of her absence or her harshness, — this forms the true and proper subject of the Ghazel. What the sonnet was to the Italians

the Ghazel was to the Persians and Turks, the literary form dedicated to the praise of Love. But notwithstanding this we shall find that it was usual with the poets to refer in their Ghazels to many other things, sometimes widely enough removed from the master passion. But while the Ghazel may thus be made to treat of anything, from the mission of the Prophet to the introduction of coffee,[1] there is a certain narrow circle of subjects which seem to have been regarded as the special and appropriate themes of this form of poetry. Prominent among these are the pleasures of wine, the delights of springtide, and the vicissitudes of fortune, with of course the woes and joys of love in the foremost place of all. It may be that a single Ghazel will touch on one and all of these things, devoting a couplet or two to each; for it is a marked feature of the form that the several couplets stand in no direct relationship to one another, so that they might be arranged in any order without affecting the general sense of the poem. All the same, although there may be no definable connection between the individual couplets, these ought never to be out of harmony with one another, and a single tone of mind should run through a whole poem. One writer has likened the Ghazel to a brilliant coruscating with glorious colours and displaying many facets, but yet a single whole. Such indeed is what ought to be, but in practice we find that in a vast number of Ghazels, especially when the work of mediocre writers, there is no more unity of thought or feeling between the several couplets than there is between the paragraphs in the columns of a newspaper. It follows of necessity that each couplet must be complete in itself, must contain a complete idea completely expressed. The two lines often present a kind of parallelism, similar

[1] Belíghí, a janissary poet of the time of Murád III, has a Ghazel on this subject.

to what is found so largely in Hebrew poetry, the second repeating, interpreting, or responding to the first. The couplets of a Ghazel have frequently been compared to pearls on a thread: the thread, they say, will make them one necklace, but the value of the necklace must lie in the beauty of each pearl, not in the thread. While this discursiveness characterises Ghazels as a class, it is far from being universal; sometimes a writer treats a given subject, or at least works a single vein of thought, throughout an entire poem; but even then, the couplets, being each an independent entity, lead up to nothing, and might be set down in any order without detriment to the whole. Ghazels devoted to a single subject occur more frequently in the Fourth Period than in earlier times; and nowadays unity of tone and sentiment, as well as avoidance of irrelevant digressions, is aimed at by the writers of these little poems. For although the Ghazel no longer maintains its old pre-eminence, it is far from having fallen into desuetude, and almost every poet of the New School has given us some examples of his skill in dealing with this old-time favourite. Fuzúlí, Báqí and Nedím are the most famous of the Ottoman Ghazel-writers; of these, the first two belong to the Second, the third to the Fourth Period.

V. The Qasída — which word in Arabic means 'Purpose-Poem' — is in form similar to the ghazel, but is much longer. Theoretically it contains not less than thirty and not more than ninety-nine couplets. It is the original Arabian form, that in which the famous Muʿallaqát and other ancient Arabic poems are written. In Persian and Turkish literature it is the special form affected by the court poetry, its proper subject being the eulogy of some great personage, a Sultan or Vezir or Sheykh of Islam. The Ottoman Qasída consists

of two parts: the Nesíb, which we may translate as the 'Exordium,' and the Maqsad or Maqsúd, literally the 'Purpose,' which we may render as the 'Panegyric.' The first of these is often extremely beautiful; its subject, which is definite, admitting of none of the discursiveness of the ghazel, may depend upon the occasion on which the poem is written and presented to the patron to whom it is dedicated. Thus if it be during Ramazán, the Muslim Lent, or at the Bayram Festival, the theme of the Exordium will likely be a poetical account of the fast or of the feast; or if it be on the occasion of the completion of a new palace or the laying out of a garden, it will be a brilliant description of the same; or again it may be simply a highly coloured picture of the season of the year, spring, summer, autumn or winter, in which the poem chances to be composed. But anything may be taken as subject; sometimes it is the great man's horse, or his sword, or his signet; sometimes it is a flower, as the rose, the hyacinth or the tulip; occasionally, as in the case of a celebrated Qasída of Nefʿí, the Exordium is purely moral or philosophic. The Panegyric, which follows the Exordium, has seldom any essential connection with it, and great dexterity is often shown by the poet in the way he dovetails the one into the other; a remote resemblance, a momentary association of ideas, will serve him as a hinge, and while he seems yet to be singing the delights of spring, we find he has begun the glorification of his patron. [1] The Panegyric itself proceeds with all the pomp and splendour of language which the poet can command; and, when the work of a master, the succession of long lines, with their stately measure and gorgeous imagery, has something of

[1] The couplet in which the transition is made bears the technical name of Guríz i. e. 'Flight,' or Guríz-gáh i. e. 'Place of the Flight;' some writers, however, apply the term Guríz-gáh to the whole Nesíb or 'Exordium.'

the magnificence of an imperial pageant. But too often the Panegyric is little more than a string of turgid and bombastic epithets, the resonance and grandiloquence of which fail to conceal the banality and insincerity beneath. The name of the patron is usually introduced near the beginning of the Panegyric, while towards the end, in a couplet, which is technically styled the Táj or 'Crown,' the writer mentions his own name, and begins a prayer for the prosperity of the great man, which closes the poem. Many writers introduce a ghazel into their Qasídas, sometimes near the beginning, sometimes near the end; this ghazel is often ostensibly addressed to some unnamed beauty and has no intimate connection with the Qasída itself beyond having the same rhyme, being in the same metre, and occasionally deriving its imagery from the same dominant subject. It is allowable in a Qasída to repeat the same rhyme-word with the same meaning, provided that at least seven couplets intervene, but it is always better to dispense when possible with this license. In poems of this class there are usually two or three matlaᶜs or rhyming couplets besides the opening distich; these are introduced here and there in the course of the poem to break the long sequence of non-musarraᶜ verses, and sometimes by way of beginning as it were a new paragraph.[1] In the Díwáns, or volumes containing the collected works of a poet, there is usually a rubric prefixed to each Qasída setting forth its subject and mentioning the name of the great man in whose honour it is composed; these rubrics are usually in Persian. The best couplet of a Qasída is technically called the Beyt-ul-Qasída or 'Couplet of the Qasída.' The Qasída, which found its most brilliant exponent

[1] A Qasída containing such couplets is technically called Zát-ul-Matáliᶜ or 'Possessor of Matlaᶜs;' and the couplets themselves are respectively styled the First Matlaᶜ, Second Matlaᶜ, Third Matlaᶜ, and so on.

in Nefʿí of Erzerum, a gifted poet of the Third Period, has in great measure passed out of fashion since the rise of the Modern School. Not only is that flattery of the great which is its ultimate aim at variance with the better taste now prevailing, but the poets of to-day rightly regard it as a waste of time and ingenuity to get together some fifty or sixty rhyming words and work these up to form the rhymes of as many couplets, as the result must almost always be a mere *tour de force*, often woefully strained and sadly deficient in every element of true poetry. Thus Báqí, who is one of the finest poets of the Second Period, has what he calls his Hyacinth Qasída to the honour and glory of his learned teacher Qaramání-záde Mehemmed Efendi, in which he makes the word Sunbul, that is 'Hyacinth,' end forty-nine lines, being preceded by as many words all rhyming together, only one of which is repeated in the whole course of the poem. The extreme difficulty of an achievement such as this, to end nearly fifty couplets with a word like 'hyacinth,' prefixing to the same in each case a different rhyme-word, and yet not only to preserve sense and avoid the evidence of labour, but also to impart to the work the charm of poetry, must be apparent to all. In most languages the feat would be simply impossible; but the wealth of rhymes in Turkish, together with the great freedom in arranging the sequence of words allowed to, or at least taken by, the old poets, render it somewhat less hopeless in their case than it would be with us. Some writers, as it would appear from mere bravado, go out of their way to choose a difficult word for the redíf of a Qasída; thus the poet Sunbul-záde Vehbí has a work of this class in which he makes the term Sukhan 'Word' end a hundred and twenty-eight lines, preceded of course by nearly as many different words all of which rhyme together. Efforts such as this are of necessity

foredoomed to be literary failures; but even when less ambitious, there are comparatively few writers whose Qasídas are at once so correct and so poetical that we can justly describe them as completely successful; and the leaders of the Modern School have done well in discouraging any further waste of time and talent in so unprofitable a field.

VI. The Qit^{c}a, literally 'Section,' is identical in form with the ghazel except that the first couplet is non-musarra^{c} instead of being rhymed. Thus if the first couplet of a ghazel be removed, the remainder will be a Qit^{c}a so far as the form is concerned. The poem, however, while it may treat of almost any subject, must confine itself to that subject; the theme may not be changed, as in the ghazel, with every couplet. A Qit^{c}a may be of any length from two couplets upwards. In the longer Qit^{c}as it is usual for the poet to introduce his name somewhere towards the close, but not in the last couplet. This form is much used for the Táríkhs or 'Chronograms,' of which more hereafter; but in these, if the poet mentions his name, he generally does so in the last distich.

The Nazm: This is simply a Qit^{c}a with a rhymed in place of an unrhymed distich for the opening couplet, and is therefore exactly the same as the ghazel in form. It differs from the latter solely in the nature of its subjects, and in the manner in which these are treated. The word Nazm means 'Verse' in general, and this is its usual application; but as a technical term it is the name of the verse-form just described.

VII. The Mustezád, literally 'Complemented,' is formed by adding to each misra^{c} or hemistich in a piece of verse a short line called the Ziyáde or 'Complement,' which may

be either read or omitted, the poem making equally good sense in either case. When the piece of verse so treated is a ghazel, it is usual to make each Ziyáde rhyme with the misra^{c} to which it is affixed. Sometimes, however, the matla^{c} and the second misra^{c}s of the succeeding Ziyáde-couplets have an independent rhyme of their own, leaving only the first misra^{c}s of the Ziyáde-couplets to rhyme with the first misra^{c}s of the couplets of the ghazel. There is only one metre in which it is allowable to write a Mustezád. [1] When really well done, the Mustezád has a pleasing effect, but the management of the Ziyáde calls for a good deal of skill on the part of the poet. The success of the poem depends upon the happiness with which these short complementary lines are worked in; for while they must not materially affect the sense of the poem, they should heighten the effect of the whole by a series of graceful and significant touches. When they fail of this, they are apt to degenerate into mere padding.

VIII. The Rubá^{c}í (in the plural Rubá^{c}íyát) or 'Quatrain' is, as its name indicates, a short poem of four lines, the first, second and fourth of which rhyme together, the third remaining blank. This arrangement of the rhymes has a very singular and pleasing effect, as the rhyme of the first two lines, which seemed to be lost on the appearance of the third, returns like an echo in the fourth and closes the little poem in a mannēr at once grateful to the ear and satisfying to the æsthetic sense. Occasionally the third line also is rhymed, but then the result is less happy as the effect just mentioned is absent. [2] There is a series of twenty-four metres,

[1] This is a variation of the fundamental metre called Hezej; the misra^{c} to which the Ziyáde is added must scan: – – ∪ | ∪ – – ∪ | ∪ – – ∪ | ∪ – –, and the Ziyáde: – – ∪ | ∪ – –.

[2] When the third line rhymes with the others the poem is called a Rubá'í-i Musarra^{c} or 'Rhymed Quatrain.'

all derived from the Hezej, peculiar to the Rubáʿí; in one of these it must be written, and they may not be used for any other form of poetry. The Rubáʿí may deal with any subject, but it should do so in a forceful or epigrammatic fashion. It is as a rule little more than a pregnant hint; the poet seems, as it were, suddenly to see some point in a new and unexpected light, this he suggests in four nervous lines, making no comment, drawing no conclusion, the reader being left to follow up for himself the train of thought when he has recovered from the slight shock of surprise which the perusal of a good Rubáʿí should at first produce. Each Rubáʿí is a unit complete in itself, and has no connection with any other. In his masterly adaptation of a selection of the Rubáʿís of the Persian poet ʿOmar-i Khayyám, the late Edward Fitzgerald has so manipulated and arranged the Quatrains chosen as to make them read as though there were a certain orderly connection between them, as though they followed one another in a naturally developing sequence, in fact, as though they were stanzas in one long poem — an idea never conceived, or at any rate never acted upon, either by Khayyám or by any other Eastern poet. [1] Rubáʿís when collected are always arranged, exactly as ghazels are, according to a certain alphabetical system which we shall learn by and by; the sense of the several poems (for, as we have seen, each Rubáʿí is a separate little poem) has nothing whatever to do with the arrangement. ʿAzmí-záde Háletí, who flourished early in the Third Period, is said to have been the most successful Rubáʿí-writer among the Ottomans. The Rubáʿí is sometimes, but not often, called Du-Beyt or 'Double-Couplet,' and occasionally Teráne, a word which means, among other things, 'Melody' or 'Harmony.' This

[1] By far the best of the English translations of ʿOmar-i Khayyám is that by Mr. John Payne, (Villon Society, 1898.)

form is so short that the poet rarely mentions his name in it.

There is a native Turkish form which in the arrangement of the rhyme is identical with the Rubá^{c}í, but which is composed in quite different metres. In East-Turkish literature this form is cultivated and called the Tuyugh or Tuyuq. It has never found its way into Ottoman literary poetry, but it lives in the Ottoman folk-verses known as Mani.

The verse-forms deriving from the monorhyme-scheme that still remain to be described are all stanzaic. It does not follow that these forms, though based on the monorhyme, are of Arabian origin; some at least are most likely Persian, while one (XI) is practically identical with a very early, and probably original, Turkish form. The first two are really but variations of a single model.

IX. The Terjí^{c}-Bend (literally 'Return-Tie') is a poem consisting of a succession of stanzas (called Terjí^{c}-Kháne or 'House of the Return') in the same metre, but each with a different rhyme. The stanzas are monorhyming and may be rhymed either exactly in the ghazel style, or in the manner called musarra^{c} when the rhyme is repeated at the end of every hemistich; but whichever system is adopted in the first stanza must be adhered to throughout the poem. The number of couplets is the same in each stanza, and is never less than five and rarely more than ten. To each stanza is added, as it were, a refrain, an unvarying rhymed couplet, which has the same metre as the rest of the poem, and may or may not rhyme with the opening stanza. This rhyming couplet is called the Wásita or 'Link,' or else the Bend or 'Tie.' Some writers, however, apply the term Bend to the Terjí^{c}-Kháne and Wásita taken together.

X. The Terkíb-Bend (literally, 'Composite Tie') is exactly the same as the preceding except that the Wásita closing the several stanzas (in this case called Terkíb-Kháne) varies on each occasion.

The Terjí^{c}-Bend and Terkíb-Bend are much used for elegies; they are also employed for mystic, philosophic, and contemplative poetry in general. Towards the close of the last stanza, but not in the Wásita, the poet mentions his name. The Terjí^{c}-Bend is reckoned the more difficult form of the two, in as much as the several stanzas have to be so worked up that the recurring Wásita falls naturally and appropriately into its place at the end of each. In the Terkíb-Bend, where the Wásita varies with every stanza, the poet has of course a much freer hand.

We now reach a second group of stanzaic verse-forms, each member of which has a special name descriptive of the number of lines in the stanza. We shall begin with the shortest and simplest.

XI. The Murebba^{c} or 'Foursome' is a poem consisting of a succession of four-line stanzas called Bend or 'Tie.' The fourth line of the first stanza may or may not rhyme with the other three which must all rhyme together. But whatever be the rhyme of the fourth line of the first stanza, that rhyme must be repeated in the fourth line of every succeeding stanza, while the first three lines of each of these must take a new rhyme. Sometimes the fourth line of the first stanza is repeated as the fourth line of each one following, and is thus made into a sort of refrain; in this case the poem is known as a Murebba^{c}-i Mutekerrir or 'Repeating Foursome.' Sometimes these fourth lines, while rhyming together, vary with each stanza, then the poem

is called a Murebbaᶜ-i Muzdevij or 'Pairing Foursome.'

As has been already said, the rhyme-arrangement of the Murebbaᶜ is practically identical with one of the most popular and most characteristic of the original Turkish rhyme-schemes, that on which most of Ahmed-i Yeseví's poems and the whole of ᶜAlí's Joseph and Zelíkhá are written.

The Terbíᶜ: Sometimes a writer builds a Murebbaᶜ on a poem, usually a ghazel, of some other author. He does this by prefixing two lines of his own to each couplet of the poem he has taken as the basis of his work. These two lines, which are called the Zamíme or 'Addition,' must be in the same metre as the poem worked on. In the first of the four-line stanzas thus formed both lines of the Zamíme must rhyme with the matlaᶜ of the ghazel taken as basis, which of course forms the last two lines of the verse; but in each of the succeeding stanzas the lines of the Zamíme must rhyme with the first or non-rhyming line of the mufred to which they are prefixed. The result is of course a perfect Murebbaᶜ-i Muzdevij. The difficulty in the Terbíᶜ (and in the similar Takhmís and Tesdís) is to make the Zamíme blend naturally and gracefully with the lines to which it is prefixed; it should so harmonise with these both in feeling and in language that the whole poem appear to be the work of one and the same writer. When this is not achieved, the stanzas have a patchy look, and the result is failure.

XII. The Mukhammes or 'Fivesome': This is exactly the same as the Murebbaᶜ except that here each stanza consists of five instead of four lines. It also may be either Mutekerrir or Muzdevij, according as the last line of the first stanza is repeated or varied in those that follow. Sometimes, however, the lines are divided by the rhyme into groups of three and two instead of four and one. In this case the

first three lines of each stanza take a different rhyme, while the last two keep the same rhyme throughout. Here again the poem may be either Mutekerrir or Muzdevij. In the Mukhammes, though it is usual, it is not essential that the fifth line, or the fourth and fifth lines, of the opening stanza rhyme with the four, or three, that precede.

The Takhmís: This is to the Mukhammes what the Terbí[c] is to the Murebba[c], namely, a Mukhammes built upon an earlier poem. It is formed in precisely the same way as the Terbí[c] except that three instead of two new lines are prefixed to each couplet of the poem chosen for basis, which here again is generally a ghazel. There is another and somewhat simpler variety of the Takhmís in which the poet constructs his Mukhammes, not upon a whole ghazel, but upon a single hemistich or upon a single couplet. In this case, if his basis be a line, he prefixes to it four, and if it be a couplet, three rhyming hemistichs of his own, which for the first stanza usually rhyme with the basis, but in each of those succeeding take a new rhyme. Such a Takhmís must necessarily be Mutekerrir. There is no necessary limit to the number of stanzas in a Takhmís of this class, whereas in a poem built on a ghazel the number of stanzas must of course be that of the couplets in the basis. The effect produced by a good Takhmís is far more pleasing than that to be obtained from an equally well constructed Terbí[c], and as a consequence the former stands in much higher favour. Thus while Terbí[c]s are comparatively rare, examples of the Takhmís abound in Ottoman literature, especially during the later Periods.

XIII. The Museddes or 'Sixsome': In this form, which is similar to the two preceding, each stanza consists of six lines or, in other words, of three couplets. The four lines of the first and second couplets of each stanza rhyme together,

but in each stanza they take a new rhyme. The third couplet of the first stanza may or may not rhyme with the two that precede, and it may or may not be repeated as the third couplet of each following stanza, and the Museddes is Mutekerrir or Muzdevij, accordingly. As with the Murebba^{c} and the Mukhammes, here also when the poem is Muzdevij the final rhyme must be retained throughout. This is one point in which poems of this second stanzaic group differ from the Terkíb-Bend where the several Wásitas have each a separate and independent rhyme. Occasionally, though rarely, the two lines of the third couplets do not rhyme together; when this is the case each line rhymes with its correspondent in the other stanzas, that is, the fifth lines of all the stanzas rhyme together, and so do the sixth lines, though they do not rhyme with each other.

The Tesdís: This is similar to the Terbí^{c} and the Takhmís, and is a Museddes built upon some previous work, usually a couplet, as in the second form of the second variety of the Takhmís. The same rules as to rhyme and metre hold for the Tesdís as for the Terbí^{c} and Takhmís.

Similar to the Murebba^{c}, the Mukhammes and the Museddes are:

XIV. The Musebba^{c} or 'Sevensome,'

XV. The Musemmen or 'Eightsome,'

XVI. The Mutessa^{c} or 'Ninesome,' and

XVII. The Mu^{c}ashsher or 'Tensome,'

in which the stanzas consist of seven, eight, nine and ten lines respectively, and all of which are of very rare occurrence.

The subjects of poems of this second stanzaic group are generally those treated in the ghazel, but such poems are

not so discursive as that favourite form, they keep as a rule more strictly to the matter in hand. The poet mentions his name in the last stanza.

With this group closes the series of Ottoman verse-forms derived from the Arabian rhyme-system, and there now remains to be described only that one form which is of purely Turkish origin.

In Turkish popular poetry, that which is the peculiar possession of the uneducated classes, and is the outcome of the native genius uninfluenced by Persian or French models, the feet are, in accordance with the true Turkish system, syllabic, not metric, and the rhyme is frequently very imperfect, sometimes merely assonant.

The generic name for the Turkish popular ballad is Turki, that is 'Turkish (-song),' — itself an eloquent witness to the national character thereof. These Turkis, which are sung all over the country, especially in the humbler circles of society, are of various forms which differ slightly from one another. One of the most popular of these is a succession of four-line stanzas, the first three lines of each of which rhyme with one another, while all the fourth lines, which may be the same throughout or may vary with each stanza, rhyme together. Some of the oldest known Turkish poems, such as ʿAlí's Joseph and Zelíkhá and many of the pieces in Ahmed-i Yeseví's Díwán-i Hikmet, [1] are, as we have seen, written in this form, which strengthens our belief that in the Turki we have a survival of the ancient pre-Persian poetry of the Turkish peoples. It is this variety of the Turki

[1] In many of Yeseví's poems the first stanza is irregularly rhymed, the second line often rhyming with the fourth instead of with the first and third, which two occasionally do not even rhyme together. All these variations reappear in the Ottoman Turki.

which about the end of the Third Period, when the native genius began to assert itself, was dressed up as a new literary form and christened

XVIII. The Sharqí, that is, 'Eastern.' In the Sharqí the syllabic feet of the turki are replaced by metric feet of the orthodox description, the faulty rhymes are done away with, while the ungrammatical or provincial expressions are banished. In short, the poem becomes a perfectly correct composition written in accordance with the prevailing Persian rules of literary art. But the memory of its humble origin is preserved in the simple nature of the feeling that characterises it and of the language in which that feeling is expressed. The ingenious conceits and rhetorical exuberances that are held to increase the merit of a ghazel or a qasída would be reckoned out of place in a Sharqí; similarly, the Persian idioms and constructions which are sought after in the other verse-forms are avoided here, and their place is taken by a more homely phraseology. The tone of the Sharqí is nearly always gay, and the meaning clear and straightforward. The subject is almost invariably love, simple human love, very often it is an invitation to the beloved to come out for a stroll to the Sweet Waters of Europe or some other favourite promenade. Another reason of the greater simplicity of the Sharqís is that they were meant to be sung. The ghazels were no doubt occasionally sung, but they were primarily intended to be read. But the Sharqí is the literary development of the turki which is essentially a song; it is therefore a song written in conformity with the canons of poetic art, and as such it is intended to be heard, not to be read and re-read like the other forms, and consequently it must be simple. Another feature of its parent, the turki, retained by the Sharqí is its comparative freedom in certain minor points

regarding form, thus the recurring line which closes the several stanzas, and which is called the Naqarát or 'Chorus,' is very often used also as the second line of the first stanza, which thus becomes irregular. Again, the Naqarát may vary with each stanza, as in the murebba^{c}-i muzdevij. In the terminology of music the name Miyán or 'Middle' is given to that portion of the music of the song to which the third stanza of a Sharqí is sung; this music is taken to be the most touching and impressive passage of the whole composition, and the poet is supposed to make his third stanza which bears the special name of Miyán-Kháne or 'Middle-House,' likewise the most tender and affecting of the poem. The poets Nedím and Wásif are perhaps the most famous of the Sharqí-writers.

Monorhyming poetry has occasionally a secondary rhyme; when this is the case, each couplet has, besides the final rhyme common to the whole poem, a special rhyme of its own which is usually repeated three times, namely, in the middle and at the end of the first hemistich and in the middle of the second, an arrangement which has the effect of cutting up the distich into four divisions. When poetry is rhymed in this manner it is said to be Musemmat. Musemmat rhyme, which is simply the Murebba^{c} arrangement adapted to the couplet, seems to have been peculiarly pleasing to the Turkish ear, and most likely formed part of the original native system. As already said, we find it in the ancient pre-Ottoman poetry produced in Central Asia; and it forms the most striking characteristic of the first rude efforts in lyric verse made by the Western Turks.

The eighteen varieties which have been described consti-

tute the series of verse-forms used in Ottoman poetry down to the time when the Modern School revolutionised the entire literary system; but there still remain for consideration a few names which indicate not the form of a poem, but the nature of its contents. Leaving aside such terms as Medhíye or 'Eulogy,' Hijv or 'Satire,' Mersíye or 'Elegy' and Hezelíyát or 'Facetiæ,' which denote varieties common to all literatures and call for no explanation, we shall confine ourselves to those which are more peculiarly Oriental.

Foremost among such is the Táríkh or 'Chronogram.' This is a word or set of words the numerical values of the letters [1] forming which give on addition the year of the Hijre, or Muhammedan era, wherein occurred the event to which such word or set of words refers. Of course a Chronogram need not be in verse, but it generally is. In this case it is usually comprised in the last line of a short poem in the qit'a form which narrates the event the date of which the Chronogram embodies. When every letter in this final hemistich is included in the addition, and when this gives the exact sum required, the Chronogram is called a Táríkh-i Támm or 'Perfect Chronogram.' When only the dotted letters are to be reckoned, the Táríkh is said to be Jevherdár or Jevherín, that is, 'Gemmed;' when only the undotted letters, it is said to be Muhmel, that is, 'Unmarked.' Sometimes the sum of the letters in the last line is either more or less than is required; recourse has then to be had to a device technically called Ta'míye or 'Enigmatizing,' which consists in suggesting to the reader by a cleverly contrived hint the sum which must be deducted from or added to the total yielded by the chronogrammatic line. [2] Offering,

[1] Every letter in the Ottoman alphabet has a numerical value.

[2] An example may help to make this clearer. Belgrade was won back from the Austrians by Mehemmed Pasha in the year of the Hijre 1152 (A. D.

as it does, a wide field for the exercise of ingenuity, the Chronogram was naturally a great favourite with the Turkish poets. It has been cultivated more or less at all times, but it reached its highest point of popularity about the beginning of the nineteenth century when flourished the greatest of all the Ottoman chronogrammatists, Surúrí, who possessed an extraordinary talent for improvising Chronograms — an almost impossible feat, one would have thought.

The composition of what are called Nazíras has likewise been at all times a very favourite exercise with the Turkish poets. The name Nazíra or 'Parallel' is given to a poem written in emulation of one by another writer. The Nazíra must be in the same metre and have the same rhyme and the same redíf (if there be one) as the poem emulated; it should moreover be conceived in a similiàr spirit. The fascination of Nazíra-writing lay in the endeavour to outdo one's fellow-craftsman on his own chosen ground. Thus a poet might select as redíf for a ghazel or qasída some word or phrase which had never been so used before, and which was particularly hard to fit in neatly and correctly. This he would work in at the end of his verses with all the skill at his command; and when the poem was published, it would be recognised by his brother-artists as a challenge to which their literary zeal and their threatened reputation alike

1739). Rághib Pasha commemorated this victory in the following chronogram:

چقاروب لشکر کفاری دیدم تاریخن * بلغراد قلعه سنی آلدی محمد پاشا

'Driving out the paynim host, I have told the chronogram thereof:
'Mehemmed Pasha hath taken the fortress of Belgrade.'

Here the sum of the letters in the second (the chronogrammatic) line is 2003, which is 851 in excess of what is required. Now the sum of the letters in the words لشکر کفار 'the paynim host' is 851; this, we are told, has been 'driven out,' so we understand that we must 'drive out' or subtract the sum 851 from 2003, on doing which we get 1152, the year of the victory.

would constrain them to respond. But 'Parallels' were not written only to the verses of contemporaries or immediate predecessors; the poets often composed them to the works of men long dead whose style they admired and whose verses they were fain to rival. The term Nazíra is used only in connection with poems written on the monorhyme system. When one poet sought to 'parallel' a long mesneví of another, his work was called a Jewáb or 'Response' to that of the latter. Thus the Suhbet-ul-Ebkár or 'Communion of Virgins' by the Ottoman poet ᶜAtá'í is said to be a Jewáb or 'Response' to the Subhet-ul-Ebrár or 'Rosary of the Just' by the Persian Jámí. This same term, Jewáb, is applied to a Khamsa or 'Quintet,' that is, a series of five mesnevís, when this is written to 'parallel' an earlier series.

There are two classes of verse composition, the Lughaz or 'Riddle' and the Muᶜammá or 'Enigma,' which, though they can hardly lay claim to being poetry, were largely cultivated by many poets and often form a special chapter in the Díwáns or collections of a poet's works. The first of these, the Lughaz or 'Riddle,' is simply a versified conundrum in which from a more or less fantastic description the name of the object which is the answer may be guessed. But the Muᶜammá or 'Enigma' or 'Logogriph' is an extraordinarily subtle and ingenious variety of conceit such as the Eastern mind revels in. The answer, which is almost always supplied — so hard is the puzzle, — is usually a proper name, and is arrived at by the manipulation, in accordance with certain conventions, of some of the words and letters contained in the two lines of which the 'Enigma' generally consists. [1]

[1] This 'Enigma' on the name ᶜAbbás by the poet Hashmet will serve as an example of the class: —

Hymns, when addressed to God, are called Munáját; when addressed to the Prophet, they are styled Naᶜt. There are usually some of each class among the collected works of a poet.

The Mesnevís alone have individual titles. In the case of romances these are as a rule formed of the names of the hero and heroine, as 'Khusrev and Shírín;' in the case of didactiç poems they are often purely fanciful, as Nefhat-ul-Ezhár 'The Waft of the Flowers;' sometimes the title may be indicative of the subject of the work, as Sáqí-Náme 'The Book of the Cupbearer,' which is the name of many poems dealing with the pleasures of wine whether literal or allegoric.

Qasídas are often distinguished by a title taken from the subject of the exordium, or from the word that forms the redíf, or, where there is no redíf, from the last letter of the rhyming words. Thus a Qasída-i Beháríya or 'Spring Qasída,' is one the exordium of which describes the spring season, a Gul Qasídasi or 'Rose Qasída' is one where the word gul or 'rose' forms the redíf, and a Qasída-i Rá'íye or 'R Qasída' is one in which the rhyme-words end in the letter R.

لباس حسننه کوز دیکدی عالم * نقاب زلفنی رفع ایتدی دیدم

Libás-i husnina göz dikdi ᶜálem:
Niqáb-i zulfini refᶜ etdi dídem.

'On the vestment of her beauty did the world fix its gaze;
'My eye set aside the veil of her curls (i. e. I saw her face through them).'

To get at the solution here we see the 'eye' must 'set aside' or replace the 'curl.' Now the word for 'eye' in the verse is دیده (díde), but there is another word with the same meaning, namely عین (ᶜayn), and this word is also the name of the letter ع; again, according to a convention that holds in Enigmas the word 'curl' may be used (because of the form of a curl) to represent the letter ل. So we have somewhere to replace a ل by a ع; doing this in the word لباس (libás) 'vestment,' we get عباس (ᶜAbbás), which is the name we wish.

88034

The term Díwán is applied to the volume which contains the collected works of a poet, excepting long mesnevís which usually form separate and independent books. In a Díwán all the pieces in the same verse-form are grouped together, the several groups forming as it were so many chapters or sections. Within certain limits the order or sequence of these groups or chapters is fixed; the qasídas always come before the ghazels, these before the rubá'ís, and these before the independent distichs and hemistichs, which last generally close the volume. The position of the chronograms and other qit'as and of pieces in the stanzaic forms is not so rigidly determined, but these usually come between the qasídas and the ghazels. The position of any short mesnevís that may be included is likewise unsettled. The enigmas, when there are any, form a subdivision of the chapter of independent distichs.

The ghazels alone are arranged among themselves in a fixed order, the poems of the other classes following one another in their several chapters at hap-hazard and without method. The ghazels are arranged in alphabetical order; not however according to the first letter of the poem, but according to the last letter of the rhyming lines, which is of course the same throughout the poem. Thus all the ghazels in which the rhyming lines end in the first letter of the alphabet are brought together and made into the first subdivision of the chapter; similarly those in which the rhyming lines end in the second letter of the alphabet are collected and formed into the second subdivision, and so on through the whole alphabet.

When the rubá'ís are so numerous as to form a volume by themselves (as occasionally happens), they are arranged in this same alphabetical order.

Although the practice is now falling somewhat into desuetude, it used to be the almost universal custom for every Turk when he became a writer of any sort, were it only a clerk in a Government office, to assume or to have given to him what is called a Makhlas, that is a pen-name or pseudonym, by which, unless he were a member of the Imperial family, he was ever afterwards commonly known. Thus such names as Fuzúlí, Nefʿí, Háletí and Ghálib are all the Makhlases of the several poets, not their personal names by which no one ever thinks of or mentions them. The Makhlas is always a significant word; it is almost invariably Arabic, very rarely Persian, never Turkish. The practice of using a Makhlas came into force among the Ottomans about the time of the invasion of Timur early in the fifteenth century.

There are a few other class-names descriptive of the character or subject of a poem; but these are of comparatively rare occurrence and will be better dealt with in the course of the History.

Comparatively few poets wrote to any considerable extent in mesneví-verse; the monorhyming forms (among which is included the sharqí) were for several reasons much more popular. For the sake of convenience we shall speak of those monorhyming forms collectively as Lyric Forms, of the work composed in them as Lyric Poetry, and of the poets who produced such work as Lyric Poets.

It is of course the Perso-Arabian prosodial system that prevails in Ottoman poetry. But this system is essentially unsuitable; for while the Perso-Arabian prosody is quantitative, there are, strictly speaking, no long vowels in the Turkish language. [1]

Ancient Turkish poetry, as exemplified in the Qudatqu Bilik, the Díwán-i Hikmet of Ahmed-i Yeseví and the Joseph and Zelíkhá of ᶜAlí, is constructed upon a very simple system which is in perfect harmony with the genius of the language. This system, which has all along prevailed in the popular songs and ballads, that is, in the true, spontaneous poetry of the Turkish people, is called Parmaq-Hisábi [2] or 'Finger Counting,' and is not quantitative, like the Perso-Arabian, but is syllabic, the lines consisting of a given number of syllables, generally from seven to fifteen, with a cæsura after

[1] The presence of ا, و or ی in a Turkish word does not indicate, as it would in an Arabic or Persian word, a long vowel; these letters are introduced merely as guides to the pronunciation; and thus in early books written while the orthography was quite unfixed we find spellings like بلر which may stand for either بولور or بيلير, and الر which may stand for either آلور (آلير) or اولور. The letters ا, و and ی were subsequently introduced into these and other words in order to avoid confusion, not to indicate long vowels. So it is incorrect in transliterating to mark such vowels as long; thus كوزل 'pretty' ought to be transliterated guzel, not gūzel or gúzel, which is not only inaccurate, but is misleading, as the accent falls not on the first, but on the second syllable.

[2] Or, in more high-flown language, Hisáb-ul-Benán.

every third or fourth, while the cadence is determined by the fall of the accent. But this method, though so well suited to the language out of which it has grown, has never been systematised, the metres of which it contains the germs have never been developed, indeed, even the existing cadenced arrangements of syllables remain unclassified and unnamed.

In the earliest West-Turkish literary verse, that written between the years 700 (1300-1) and 800 (1397-8), this system is generally, though not universally, employed. The poets of those days took considerable license; their metres, it is true, were always Persian, but while they made the feet as a rule syllabic, they would frequently, merely to suit their own convenience, treat them as quantitative. This blending of the Turkish and Persian systems is characteristic of that period; for it is noteworthy that there is scarcely a trace of the Turkish method of scansion in the poetry produced after the invasion of Timur at the beginning of the fifteenth century. That calamitous event forms a landmark in the development of West-Turkish poetry, that which is on the hither side being far less Turkish and more Persian than that which is on the farther.

The native Turkish metres fared even worse than the native Turkish system of scansion. But these metres were so like the Persian both in the number of their syllables and in their cadence that their supercession by, or rather their absorption into, the latter was inevitable as soon as the Turks began to look to Persia for guidance. Thus the metre of the Qudatqu Bilik is very like the Persian Mutaqárib of the Sháh-Náme; while the special eleven-syllable metre of the Tuyugh or East-Turkish quatrain is practically identical with the second form of the Remel described a little farther on. Things being so, it is but natural that while traces of the native system of scansion linger on for a century

in West-Turkish poetry, there should be no equally obvious vestiges of the ancient metres.

In the prosodial system elaborated by the Arabs and adopted by the Persians a vowel is long either naturally or by position. It is long naturally when accompanied by one of the letters of prolongation, it is long by position when followed by two consonants. When this prosody came to be systematically applied to the Turkish language, while there was no trouble as to the vowels that were long by position, the poets found themselves confronted with a difficulty in connection with the vowels that were accounted long naturally; for there are no long vowels in Turkish words, the presence in such of any of those letters which in Arabic or Persian mark prolongation being merely a guide to the pronunciation. They therefore determined that while the vowels in such Arabic and Persian words as were used in Turkish should continue to bear the same value as in their proper language, these vowels which in purely Turkish words are accompanied by what in Arabic or Persian would be reckoned a letter of prolongation, while remaining normally and properly short, might by a license be regarded as long when the exigencies of metre so required. This license, which is technically called Imále or 'Inclination,' was very largely used by the old poets; but unless employed for some special purpose, such as to give additional emphasis to a word, its presence is as a rule a defect from an artistic point of view, as it not only imparts a lumbering movement to the lines, but a feeling of discomfort is evoked on encountering words thus as it were racked on a Procrustean bed.

The Perso-Arabian prosodial system, in accordance with which is composed all Ottoman literary poetry of the Old School, is exceedingly elaborate and intricate. The whole subject is technical in the highest degree, and any attempt

to explain the principles upon which it is built and the laws by which it is regulated would be out of place in this History. Such a study would moreover be of no practical utility for our purpose here which will be better served by learning what actually are the metres most commonly used by the Ottoman poets.

In the Arabian prosody as modified by the Persians and accepted by the Turks there are some dozen or more distinct metres, [1] each of which, besides its normal or standard form, comprises a number of variations. Each of these metres has a special name, and each of the variations has a compound name which is held to describe by more or less remote analogy the nature of its departure from the normal form.

The following are the most usual in Ottoman poetry: —

I. The normal form of the metre called Hezej; it is: — [2]

∪ — — — | ∪ — — — | ∪ — — — | ∪ — —

This is much used in lyric poetry, especially for ghazels and qasídas.

The following are all variations of the Hezej: —

∪ — — — | ∪ — — — | ∪ — —

This measure is much used for mesnevís. Composed in it we have amongst others Sheykhí's Khusrev u Shírín, *Zátí's* Shem^{c}u Perwáne, *Mesíhí's* Shehr-engíz, *Áhí's* Khusrev u Shírín, Hamdí's Leylí u Mejnún, Kemál-Pasha-záde's Yúsuf u Zelíkhá, Lámi^{c}í's Víse u Rámín and Yahya Bey's Yúsuf u Zelíkhá.

— — ∪ | ∪ — — ∪ | ∪ — — ∪ | ∪ — —

The above is chiefly used for lyric forms.

— — ∪ | ∪ — ∪ — | ∪ — —

This is another favourite for mesnevís; the two finest in the language, Fuzúlí's Leylí u Mejnún and Sheykh Ghálib's

[1] The authorities differ as to the exact theoretical number; but practically only eight are in use among the Turks.

[2] In every case the scheme shown is that of a single hemistich.

Husn u ᶜAshq, are both written in it; so is Nábí's Khayrábád.

— — ∪ | ∪ — — — | — — ∪ | ∪ — — —

This is a lyric measure.

II. Two forms only of the Rejez metre are used; the standard: —

— — ∪ — | — — ∪ — | — — ∪ — | — — ∪ —

and this variation: —

— — ∪ — — | — — ∪ — —

Both are lyric.

III. Of the Remel metre four forms, all variations, are in use.

— ∪ — — | — ∪ — — | — ∪ — — | — ∪ —

This, which is a very favourite lyric measure, finds a fairly close English parallel in the fifteen syllable trochaic measure rendered familiar by Tennyson's 'Locksley Hall.'

— ∪ — — | — ∪ — — | — ∪ — — | — ∪ —

Locksley Hall that in the distance overlooks the sandy flats.

— ∪ — — | — ∪ — — | — ∪ —

This form is used both for mesnevís and lyrics. It is the measure in which the great Persian poet Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín wrote his famous Mesneví-i Maᶜneví, which book, as we shall see in another chapter, gave the keynote for the earliest Turkish poetry; and so this was the measure in which the first poets composed their mesnevís, the Rebáb-Náme of Sultán Veled, the Gharíb-Náme of ᶜAshiq Pasha, the Mevlid of Suleymán Chelebi and the Iskender-Náme of Ahmedí being all in this variation of the Remel.

— ∪ — — | ∪ ∪ — — | ∪ ∪ — — | — —

This is a lyric measure.

The following measure has four forms which may be used together indiscriminately: —

— ∪ — — | ∪ ∪ — — | — —

— ∪ — — | ∪ ∪ — — | ∪ ∪ —

⏑ ⏑ – – | ⏑ ⏑ – – | – –

⏑ ⏑ – – | ⏑ ⏑ – – | ⏑ ⏑ –

This is chiefly used for mesnevís; in it are composed Yahya Bey's Genjíne-i Ráz, Kháqání's Hilye-i Sheríf, ᶜAtá'í's Suhbet-ul-Ebkár, Nábí's Khayríya, and Fázil Bey's Khúbán-Náme, Zenán-Náme and Defter-i ᶜAshq.

IV. Practically only one form of the metre Serí[c] is used; it is a variation: —

– ⏑ ⏑ – | – ⏑ ⏑ – | ⏑ –

Yahya Bey's Gulshen-i Enwár and ᶜAtá'í's Nefhat-ul-Ezhár are written in this.

V More popular is the following variation of the metre Khafíf; this like the fourth variety of the Remel has four forms which are used together indiscriminately: —

– ⏑ – – | ⏑ – ⏑ – | – –

– ⏑ – – | ⏑ – ⏑ – | ⏑ ⏑ –

⏑ ⏑ – – | ⏑ – ⏑ – | – –

⏑ ⏑ – – | ⏑ – ⏑ – | ⏑ ⏑ –

In this we have Hamdí's Yúsuf u Zelíkhá, Fazlí's Gul u Bulbul, Yahya Bey's Sháh u Gedá, ᶜAtá'í's Heft-Kh'án and ᶜIzzet Molla's Gulshen-i ᶜAshq.

VI. Three variations of the metre called Muzári[c] are often met with: —

– – ⏑ | – ⏑ – | ⏑ – – ⏑ | – ⏑ –

and

– – ⏑ | – ⏑ – – | – – ⏑ | – ⏑ – –

and

⏑ – ⏑ – | ⏑ – ⏑ – | ⏑ – ⏑ – | ⏑ – ⏑ –

These are all lyric measures.

VII. Of the Mujtes metre one variation is in pretty frequent use; it too is lyric: —

⏑ – ⏑ – | ⏑ ⏑ – – | ⏑ – ⏑ – | – –

VIII. One variation of the Mutaqárib metre is frequent: —

⏑ – – | ⏑ – – | ⏑ – – | ⏑ –

This is chiefly used for mesnevís; in it are written Yahya Bey's Kitáb-i Usúl, the Sáqí-Námes of Háletí, of ʿAtáʾí and of the Sheykh of Islam Yahya Efendi, also the Zafer-Náme of Sábit and the Mihnet-Keshán of ʿIzzet Molla.

In one or other of the measures represented by the foregoing eighteen schemes is written almost the whole of the literary poetry of Turkey, the only notable exception being the rubáʿís or quatrains, which have a series of measures peculiar to themselves. There are twenty-four of these rubáʿí-measures, all modifications of a variation of the Hezej metre; and the four lines of a single rubáʿí may be in any four of these.

It is manifestly impossible to exactly reproduce the Oriental measures in an English translation; the frequent successions of long syllables alone would forbid this. But a sufficiently close approximation may be obtained by preserving identity in the number of syllables and arranging the accents so that the cadence of the original is suggested; thus the English fifteen syllable trochaic measure already mentioned supplies a very fair representative of the most popular of the Remel forms.

The ʿIlm-i Belâghat, the Perso-Arabian Art of Rhetoric, was till the last quarter of the nineteenth century the only rhetorical system known to the Ottomans.

This Eastern Art of Rhetoric is divided into three great branches: (1) the ʿIlm-i Maʿâní or 'Science of Significations,' which deals with the arrangement of periods and the appropriate employment of phrases: (2) the ʿIlm-i Beyán or 'Art of Exposition,' which treats of the various ways in which a thought or idea may be expressed: (3) the ʿIlm-i Bedíʿ or 'Art of Verbal Embellishment' or, as we may render it, the 'Art of Euphuism,' which explains the nature and use of the rhetorical figures that form the decorative element in literary work.

With the first of these three branches, the ʿIlm-i Maʿâní, we are not here concerned. The second, the ʿIlm-i Beyán, which has four subdivisions, deals with a series of figures founded on resemblance or contiguity, such as the simile, metaphor, synecdoche and metonymy, which, though differently classed, are essentially the same as with ourselves, and therefore require no description. [1] It is the third branch,

[1] The four subdivisions of the ʿIlm-i Beyán are:

(1) The Teshbíh or 'Comparison' (including both our Simile and Metaphor).

(2) The Istiʿâre or 'Trope,' that is the employment of a word in other than its proper sense, thus in this line of Sheykhí,

کجایی کندزه ایلادی پرده

'She veiled the day with the night,'

the ʿIlm-i Bedíʿ, the 'Art of Euphuism,' which renders it necessary for us to give some attention to Eastern rhetoric, for here we have a number of highly characteristic figures, many of which have no counterpart in our own manuals.

In the Art called Bedíʿ or 'Euphuism' there is then a large number of Figures (technically called Sanʿat), each of which is in most cases minutely subdivided. Most of these figures are common to poetry and prose; but some are peculiar to poetry, while others again are peculiar to prose. The last of these sections we shall leave out of sight as not being pertinent to our present subject, and confine our attention to the more important or more characteristic figures of the other two.

Some of these are either so familiar to us already, or bear names so self-explanatory, that they call for no description. Such are the Tazádd or 'Antithesis;' the Mubálagha or 'Hyperbole;' [1] the Telmíh or 'Allusion;' [2] the Rujúʿ or 'Epanorthosis;' the Iqtibás or 'Quotation' (from the Ḳoran or

the words 'day' and 'night,' which stand respectively for 'face' and 'hair' are istiʿáres or 'tropes.'

(3) The Mejáz-i Mursel or 'Synecdoche.'

(4) The Kináye or 'Metonymy.'

In the last two cases the translations are merely approximate, as several classes of the Mejáz-i Mursel would be reckoned by Western rhetoricians as varieties of the Kináye or 'Metonymy,' and vice versa. Each of these four subdivisions of the Beyán is further divided into numerous classes. The modern Ottoman rhetoricians restrict the Kináye to 'Inuendo,' which in old times was one of its classes.

[1] The Mubálagha or 'Hyperbole' is divided into three classes:

(1) Teblígh, when the exaggeration is possible both to reason and experience.

(2) Ighráq, when the exaggeration is possible to reason but not to experience.

(3) Ghuluvv, when the exaggeration is possible neither to reason nor to experience.

[2] i. e. allusions to incidents in history, romance, etc., with which the cultured reader is supposed to be familiar.

Hadís); and the Tazmín or 'Quotation' (from another poet).[1] But with most of the figures the case is otherwise; and the more popular of these we shall now briefly consider.

Among the greatest favourites in the group of figures that depend upon the sense of the words, and not upon their position in the verse or upon their form, are the following: —

Husn-i Taʿlíl or 'Ætiology:' this figure, the name of which literally translated means 'Eloquent Assignment of Cause,' consists in the assignment of some graceful but fictitious reason for some fact or occurrence, as in this couplet: —

'Within the garth the Rose hath hid behind the verdant leaves,
'Shame-faced, her glory humbled by the lustre of your cheek.'[2]

Here the poet attributes the rose's being red and its growing behind some leaves to the discomfited flower's blushes and its desire to conceal itself on having been outdone in beauty by the cheek of the lady he addresses. This figure, which, when prettily conceived and expressed, is extremely graceful, is of very frequent occurrence.

Ihám (sometimes called Tevríye) or 'Amphibology:' this is a kind of pun, and consists in the employment of a word or phrase having more than one appropriate meaning whereby the reader is often left in doubt as to the real signification of the passage. As a rule the more unusual meaning is that really intended; and if this should give offence, the poet can always protest that he employed the word in its ordinary sense. The very numerous instances in which a poet plays upon the meaning of his own name are examples of the Ihám.

Closely allied to the foregoing is the Ihám-i Tenásub or

[1] In the Tazmín the poet quotes the first line of a couplet by another poet, but substitutes a line of his own for the second.

[2] کیزلندی گلستانده یشیل یاپراق آردینه
رنك عذارکزدن اولوب شرمسار گل

'Amphibological Congruity.' Here while one of the significations of the amphibological word is obviously intended, the other, though clearly not meant, has some congruity with the subject in hand, as in this distich of ᶜAlí Hayder Bey: —

'Proud of its rosebud, the branch of the rose
'Tosses, and flouts *rúzgár* (i. e. Fortune; the wind).' [1]

Here the word *rúzgár* is evidently used in its sense of 'fickle Fortune' or 'the world' in general, which the rose-branch, proud of its loveliness, is said to look on with disdain; yet the other meaning of *rúzgár*, namely 'wind,' is congruous when speaking of a twig tossing in the breeze. Both forms of Amphibology are very often met with; it is of course hardly ever possible to suggest them in translation.

Tejáhul-i ᶜÁrif, literally, 'Feigned Ignorance:' this figure consists in affecting ignorance of what one knows in order to heighten the effect of one's statement, as in this opening couplet from one of Nefᶜí's qasídas: —

'Say, is this Adrianople-town or is it Eden-bower?
'Say, is yon the Royal Pavilion or a Paradisal tower?' [2]

The poet knows perfectly well that the place he is praising is Adrianople and not Paradise, but he affects doubt in order to heighten the effect of his eulogy.

Irsál-i Mesel, literally, 'Proverbial Commission:' this consists in quoting and applying a proverb in a single distich; by its means the poet is able to enforce his statement by the citation of some well-known adage. The practice of quoting proverbs, which was always more or less popular, was carried to great lengths by the poets of the Third and Fourth Periods.

شاخ کل غنچه‌سیله سرافراز * صالسه‌ور روزگاره ایلر ناز
ادرنه شهریمی بو یا کلشن مأوامیدر
انده قصر پادشاهی جنّت اعلامیدر

The figures comprised in the following group depend on the position of the words or phrases in the verse.

Leff u Neshr, literally, 'Fold and Spread:' this consists in naming two or more subjects and subsequently naming their respective attributes, as in this couplet of Nedím: —

'They've distilled the rose's fragrance, broidered daintily its leaf;
'One is made thy perspiration, one is made the towel for thee.'[1]

We have this figure in English, thus in Shakspere's 'Venus and Adonis:' —

'An oven that is stopped, or river stayed,
'Burneth more hotly, swelleth with more rage.'

Sometimes the order of the attributes is reversed, in which case the figure is said to be 'Irregular.'

ᶜAks or 'Antistrophe:' this consists in the reciprocal conversion of the same words in different clauses, as in this couplet from Sheykh Ghálib's allegory 'Beauty and Love:' —

Etdi rukh-i husni nesteren-zár
Rukhsáre-i ᶜashq ve *ᶜashq-i rukhsár*

'The face of Love and the love of (his) face
'Made Beauty's cheek a bower of eglantine.'[2]

Here in the phrases *rukhsáre-i ᶜashq* (face of love) and *ᶜashq-i rukhsár* (love of face) the words are mutually reversed.

Tard u ᶜAks or 'Epanodos:' this consists in forming the second line of a distich from the reversed halves of the first line, as in this couplet: —

Hengám-i juwání dir tahsíl-i huner waqti,
Tahsíl-i huner waqti hengám-i juwání dir.

بوی کل تقطیر اولنمش نازك ایشلنمش اوجی
بیری اولمش خوی بیری دستمال اولمش سکا

ایتدی رخ حسنی نسترنزار * رخسارهٔ عشق و عشق رخسار[2]

'The season of youth is the time to acquire knowledge,
'The time to acquire knowledge is the season of youth.' [1]

In the foregoing example the conversion is complete and the figure is called 'Perfect;' when it is less complete, the figure is 'Imperfect.' We have the figure in English, as in this couplet of Milton: —

'O more exceeding love, or law more just;
'Just law indeed, but more exceeding love.'

Redd-ul-ᶜAjzi ᶜale-s-Sadr or 'Epanadiplosis:' this consists in repeating in the second hemistich of a couplet a word or phrase that occurs in the first. It has several varieties according to the position of the repeated word, its 'Perfect' form being when the first word of the first line is made the last word of the second.

Iᶜáde or 'Epanastrophe:' in this figure the last word of one couplet is made the first of the next. When a poem is formed upon this plan it is said to be Muᶜád.[2]

The figures in the next series depend on the form of words.

Tejnís or 'Homonymy' or 'Paronomasia:' this, which is a variety of pun, is one of the greatest favourites among the rhetorical figures, and is subdivided into a large number of classes. It consists in the employment of words having the same or similar forms and sounds.

The Jinás or 'Homonymy' is said to be 'Perfect' when

[1] هنكام جوانيدر تحصيل هنر وقتى
تحصيل هنر وقتى هنكام جوانيدر

[2] The best-known example in Turkish is the beautiful ghazel of Fuzúlí which begins: —

اى وجود كاملك اسرار حكمت مصدرى
مصدرى ذاتك اولان اشيا صفاتك مظهرى

'O Thou whose perfect Being is the Source of the secrets of wisdom!
'Those things whose Source is Thine Essence are the vehicles for the manifestation of Thine Attributes.'

the homonymous words have exactly the same form and sound, as in this couplet: —

Ider iráqa-i *dem* hasretiñ-la cheshmánim;
Terahhum it, nije *dem* dir esír-i hijrán im.

'Through yearning for thee my eyes pour forth blood;
'Have pity! how long a time am I the thrall of separation!' [1]

Here the Arabic word *dem*, 'blood,' and the Persian word *dem*, 'time,' have exactly the same form and sound.

The Jinás is said to be Mefrúq or 'Disjoined' when the two terms are not written alike, as in this example: —

Rukhsáriñi, ey dilber, *áyíneye* beñzetdim;
Veh! veh! ne khatá etdim! *ayi neye* beñzetdim?

'O fair one, I likened thy face to the mirror;
'Alack! alack! what a mistake I have made! to what have I likened the moon?' [2]

Here the word *áyíneye* 'to the mirror' is matched by the two words *ayi neye* 'the moon to what.' By 'the moon' the face of the beauty is meant.

The Jinás is Merfú or 'Repaired' when one of the terms is completed only by adding to it a portion of another word; as in this couplet by Safá Bey: —

Yoq-ken guneshiñ eshi *semáde*
Bir esh gurinurdi shem*se máde*

'Though the sun has no mate in the sky,
'There appeared a mate to the sun in the water.' [3]

Here to match the single word *semáde* 'in the sky' the last syllable of *shemse* 'to the sun' has to be taken along with the word *máde* 'in the water.' The mate of the sun

ایدر اراقهٔ دم حسرتکله چشمانم
ترحّم ایت نیجه دم در اسیر هجرانم
رخساریکی ای دلبر آیینهیه بکزتدم
وه وه نه خطا ایتدم آیی نهیه بکزتدم

[3] یوقکن کونشك اشی سماده * بر اش کورینوردی شمسه ماده

in the water is of course the reflection. This variety of Homonymy has always been very popular, even from the earliest times. The following English example will make the principle quite clear: —

Wandering far, they went *astray*,
When fell on the hills the sun's l*ast ray*.

The Jinás is said to be Láhiq or 'Contiguous' when the two words have the same letters except one letter in each of the two; this irregular letter may be initial, medial or final. In this example it is the initial letter that is irregular:

Sebáti yoq bu ʿálemiñ, aña kim iʿtimád ider
Ferah gelir, *terah* gider, *terah* gelir, *ferah* gider.

'Inconstant ever is the world, and he who doth thereon repose
'Now gladly comes, now sadly goes, now sadly comes, now gladly goes.'[1]

The 'gladly' and 'sadly' of the translation, which represent the *ferah* and *terah* of the original, suggest the Jinás.

The Jinás is Náqis or 'Defective' when one of the terms has an extra letter, initial, medial or final.[2]

The Jinás is Muharref or 'Altered' when the letters of the terms are all alike, but the vowel points differ, as in the couplet: —

Shehriñ ichinde shuhreti artar jemáliniñ
Evsáf-i *verd*-i ʿárizi *vird*-i zebán olur.

'The fame of her beauty increaseth in the city,
'The praise of her rose-cheek is the theme of (every) tongue.'[3]

Here the letters in the words *vrd* 'rose' and *vrd* 'theme' are alike, it is only the vowel points (usually unmarked in Eastern writings) that differ.

ثباتی یوق بو عالمك آکا کیم اعتماد ایدر
فرح کلیر ترح کیدر ترح کلیر فرح کیدر

[2] As in the words سن and حسن; النجا and النتجا; باد and بادی.

[3] شهرك ایچنده شهرتی آرتار جمالنك * اوصاف ورد عارضی ورد زبان اولور

The Jinás is said to be Khattí or 'Scriptory' when the form of the two words is the same, but the dots differ.[1]

Qalb or 'Anagram:' this is reckoned among the varieties of the Jinás. When the transposition of the letters is total, as in the English words 'live' and 'evil,' the Anagram is said to be 'Perfect.' This verse contains an example: —

Öñine ebr-i siyáhi chekerek,
Etdi pinhán *kelef*-i bedri *felek*.

'Drawing a dark cloud before it,
'The sky concealed the freckles (i. e. the spots) of the moon.'[2]

When the transposition of the letters is only partial, the Anagram is said to be Baᶜz or 'Partial.'[3]

Qalb-i Musteví or 'Palindrome:' in this, which is an extended anagram, a complete line, sometimes a complete distich, is the same when read backward or forward.[4]

In the Jinás-i Muzdevij or 'Coupled Homonymy' part of an antecedent word subsequently forms a whole word, as in this couplet of Sámí: —

Qachan kim nukte-senj olub achar ol máh-i *gulfem fem*
Rumúz-i ʿilm-ul-esmádan urmaz dakhi *Adem dem*.

'When that rosy Moon opens her mouth in subtle sayings
'Adam no longer brags about the mysteries of the Science of Names.'[5]

[1] As in the words تسخير and تسخير.

[2] اوكنه ابر سياهى چكەرك * ايتدى پنهان كلف بدرى فلك

[3] As in the words اهمال *ihmál* and امهال *imhál*; مادر *máder* and مدار *medár*; جانى *jání* and ناجى *náji*.

[4] In this couplet of Nazmí each line is palindromic: —

البى لعل درد لعلى بلا * او در او روحه حور وار دوا

'Her blandishments are ruby (i. e. intoxicating like ruby wine), the pain caused by her ruby (red lip) is anguish;
'It (her ruby lip) is houri-like, the cure for that soul (i. e. the lover's).'

[5] قيچنكم نكتەسنج اولوب اچار اول ماه كلفم فم
رموز علم الاسمادن اورمز داخى آدم دم

The allusion in the second line is to the story in the Koran according to

There is another variety of this figure in the following distich of the same poet: —

Shí'a-vesh ákhir olur qámeti *álámda lám*
Chiqaran waz'-i teberra ile *dushnámda nám*

'At last will the form of him become a *lám*[1] through woes who like the Shí'a[2]
'Maketh his name by introducing denunciation in abuse.'[3]

Mushákele: this figure consists in using a word twice consecutively, once in a natural, and once in a figurative sense.

Ishtiqáq or 'Paronymy:' this consists in bringing together words derived from a common root, as in this couplet of Fu'ád Pasha: —

Hukúmet hikmet ile mushterek dir,
Vezír olan *hakím* olmaq gerek dir.

'Authority and wisdom should go together;
'He who is vezir, he should be wise.'[4]

Here the words *hukúmet* 'authority,' *hikmet* 'wisdom,' and *hakím* 'wise,' are all derived from the Arabic root *HKM.*

Shibh-i Ishtiqáq or 'Quasi-Paronymy:' in this the words, though apparently of common derivation, are in reality not so, as in the line: —

Qalir-mi básira *khálí khayál*-i *khál*indan?

'Will the eye bide void of the image of her mole?'[5]

Here the Arabic words *khálí* 'void' and *khayál* 'image'

which God taught Adam the Names of all things, and then enquired them of the angels, who, being unable to tell them, were bidden hear them from Adam and then bow down in adoration before him. This they all did except Iblís who, being puffed up with pride, refused to obey the Divine command, whereupon he was driven from the presence of God, and became Satan.

[1] i. e. become bent like the letter *lám* ل.

[2] A Shí'a is an adherent of the heretical sect that prevails in Persia, one o the customs of which is to denounce the first three Khalífas.

[3] شیعه‌وش آخراولور قامتی آلامده لام * چیقرن وضع تبرّا ایله دشنامده نام

[4] حکومت حکمت ایله مشترکدر * وزیر اولان حکیم اولمق کرکدر

[5] قالیرمی باصره خالی خیال خالندن

and the Persian word *khál* 'mole,' though they resemble one another, are all three quite distinct in origin.

The next group contains figures dependent on the letters composing the words.

Hazf: this consists in using only words formed entirely of undotted letters; a poem composed of such words is said to be Mahzúf. Menqút: this is the reverse of the preceding, and consists in using only words formed entirely of dotted letters. Raqtá: this consists in arranging words so that the letters are dotted and undotted alternately. Khayfá: this consists in using alternately words composed wholly of dotted and wholly of undotted letters. Muqatta^{c}: this consists in using words none of the letters of which join. Muwassal: this consists in using words all of the letters in which join. The late Ziyá Pasha has two Mahzúf qasídas, both of which are printed in his great anthology called the Kharábát or 'Tavern;' but I have not met any Turkish examples of the other varieties though they are mentioned in books on rhetoric and illustrated by trivial Persian verses.

A number of points connected with the manipulation and arrangement of rhyme are likewise reckoned among the rhetorical figures. Of these the most important are: —

Irsád or 'Preparation:' this consists in hinting or suggesting to the reader or hearer of a poem in monorhyme — once he knows the rhyme-sound — what will be the rhyme-word before he reaches the end of the distich, as in this couplet from a ghazel of ^{c}Asim Efendi the famous translator into Turkish of the great Arabic and Persian dictionaries named respectively the Qámús and the Burhán-i Qáti^{c}:

Nije bir khidmet-i makhlúq ile makhzúl olalim? —
Sá'il-i Haqq olalim, ná'il-i *mes'úl* olalim.

'Wherefore should we be cast off serving the creature? —
'Let us pray of God, let us attain our prayer!' [1]

[1] نیچه بر خدمت مخلوق ایله مخذول اولهلم * سائل حق اولهلم نائل مسئول اولهلم

Here the reader having learned from the word *makhzúl* in the first line that the rhyme-sound is *úl* (the *olalim* is a redíf), is prepared on encountering the word *sá'il* at the beginning of the second to meet its passive form *me'súl* as the rhyme-word.

Iltizám or 'Supererogation,' also called Luzúm-i má lá Yelzem or 'Making Necessary the Unnecessary,' and I'nát: this consists in using a given letter or sound in addition to what the rules of rhyme demand. One variety has been described in the note on page 75.

Zú-l-Qáfíyeteyn or 'Double-Rhyme:' here each rhyming line of the poem has two distinct rhymes. When these are contiguous the Double-Rhyme is said to be Mutaqarrin or 'Adjacent,' as in this couplet of Nábí: —

Efzúní-i $\overset{1}{hayát}$ $\overset{2}{kem\text{-}ázárliqda}$ dir,
Ser-máye-i $\overset{1}{neját}$ $\overset{2}{sebuk\text{-}bárliqda}$ dir.

'Increase of life is in scantness of trouble,
'The fund of salvation is in the lightness of (one's) load.' [1]

Here the rhyme-words *kem-ázárliqda* and *sebuk-bárliqda* (the *dir* is a redíf) are immediately preceded by the rhyming words *hayát* and *neját*.

When one or more words intervene between the two rhyming words the Double-Rhyme is said to be Mahjúb or 'Screened,' as in this couplet also by Nábí: —

$\overset{1}{{}^{c}Alem}$ esír-i dest-i $\overset{2}{meshíyet}$ digil-mi dir?
$\overset{1}{Adem}$ zebún-i penche-i $\overset{2}{qudret}$ digil-mi dir?

'Is not the world thrall in the hand of Will?
'Is not man powerless in the grasp of (the Divine) Might?' [2]

Here several words intervene between the rhyme-words *'álem — meshíyet* and *ádem — qudret*.

[1] افزونئ حیات کم آزارلقده در * سرمایهٔ نجات سبکبارلقده در

[2] عالم اسیر دست مشیّت دکلمیدر * آدم زبون پنجهٔ قدرت دکلمیدر

Zú-l-Qawáfí or 'Polyrhyme:' here each rhyming line of the poem has more than two rhymes as in this couplet again by Nábí: —

Pá-der-gil-i *telásh maqálin-la khámeler*,
Píchídé-i *firásh khayálin-la námeler*

'Discoursing of Thee are the reed-pens stuck fast in the clay of agitation;
'Imagining Thee, do the treatises writhe on the bed.'[1]

Here there are three pairs of rhymes, *telásh* and *firásh*, *maqálin-la* and *khayálin-la*, *khámeler* and *námeler*. The Polyrhyme also can be 'Screened,' as well as 'Adjacent' as in the foregoing example.

Tersíᶜ literally 'Bejewelling:' this is a yet further elaboration of rhyme in which each word in the first hemistich has a corresponding word of the same rhyme and measure in the second, the only exceptions being parts of the verb substantive and particles, which are repeated. Poetry thus rhymed is said to be Murassaᶜ or 'Bejewelled.' These lines offer an example: —

Bí-khazán qalsun behár-i gulshenin!
Mustaᶜán alsun qarár-i dushmenin!

'Autumnless may the spring of thy garden remain!
'May He whose aid we pray bear off the peace of thy foe!'[2]

The two lines that follow show how this trick would work out in English: —

Thine be cheery gladness, yéa, and dear delight!
Mine be weary sadness, aye, and drear despite!

There are further a few miscellaneous figures, the most noteworthy of which are the following.

Beráᶜat-i Istihlál 'Eloquent Presagement:' this consists in foreshadowing at the opening of a long poem, such as a

[1] پا درکل تلاش مقالکله خامه‌لر * پیچیده فراش خیالکله نامه‌لر

[2] بی خزان قالسون بهار کلشنك * مستعان آلسون قرار دشمنك

romantic mesneví, the subject of the poem and the manner of its treatment. This figure is very common in prose works also.

Telmíᶜ: this consists in writing a poem partly in Turkish and partly in Arabic or Persian, the lines or half-lines being alternately in the one language and the other. Poetry composed in this macaronic fashion is said to be Mulemmaᶜ or 'Pied.'

When poetry can be scanned in more than one metre it is said to be Mutelevvin or 'Polychromatic.'

Acrostic verse is called Muveshshah.

The foregoing list of figures, though very far from complete, is sufficient for our purpose, and will moreover give some idea of the extremely elaborate character of the Oriental Art of Rhetoric. But now, so far as Turkey is concerned, this old Eastern art is a thing of the past. Its knell was sounded when in 1299 (1881-2) Ekrem Bey published his Taᶜlím-i Edebíyát or 'Lessons in Composition.' In that admirable work where for the first time the canons of Western literary taste were systematically placed before the Turkish student, the entire rhetorical system is revolutionised. The old divisions of Maᶜání, Beyán and Bedíᶜ are abolished, and nine tenths of the figures we have been considering are swept away as incompatible with earnestness and sincerity in modern times. But as up till then the old system held undisputed sway, the attention we have bestowed on it is justified.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORICAL OUTLINE.

It will be helpful, if before starting on our journey, we trace an outline map of the road we are to follow; we shall therefore, before beginning the story of Ottoman poetry, sketch roughly and briefly the line of its development.

The history of strictly Ottoman poetry does not begin till the middle of the fifteenth century.

During the preceding hundred and fifty years, which we have called the First Period, a good deal of Turkish literature was produced in Asia Minor; but only a very small proportion of this was the work of strictly Ottoman writers. Each of the several little states into which the Turkish population of Western Asia was divided still looked upon itself as a distinct and separate power, and viewed its neighbours with a jealous, if not a hostile, eye. It was the work of Ottoman statecraft during this century and a half to bind together these antagonistic members of a single family, and through their union to re-create a Turkish empire in Western Asia.

This embryonic period of the Ottoman Empire was likewise the embryonic period of Ottoman literature. During this period the Western branch of the Turkish language was

gradually shaping itself to become a literary medium; and during this period was determined by a combination of circumstances which, as we have seen, were beyond the control of the Turkish peoples the direction which their literature was to take, and the lines along which it was to develop. The age and the locality between them decreed that this direction was to be that of the Persian masters, that these lines were to be those of Persian poetry.

The primary result of this was the definite adoption as a fundamental principle by the strictly Ottoman poetry that followed of a practice which had held more or less from the very start, the practice of looking for guidance to contemporary Persian poetry and following whatever movement might develop therein.

The second result was the infection of Ottoman poetry in its every aspect with a Persianism so potent and so inveterate that its effects are operative even to the present day.

Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín of Rúm presided at the birth of West-Turkish poetry, and during the First Period his was the most powerful personal influence. The poets who wrote under the immediate influence of this great teacher were too deeply engrossed in their subject to spare much attention to the merely literary aspect of their work, even had the language not been in so rough-hewn a condition as to render anything but the plainest and baldest style practically impossible. So although towards the close of the period, after the invasion of Timur, when the influence of Nizámí had made itself felt, a certain interest began to be shown in the more purely artistic side of poetry, the leading characteristic, from a literary point of view, of the work of the First Period is its naïveté.

By the middle of the fifteenth century — that is, by the time when through the Ottoman's having become paramount

in the land his dialect had been definitely accepted as the court and literary language of the new West-Turkish Empire, — the mystic atmosphere which in earlier years had so closely enveloped Nearer Asia was in certain measure passed away, and men were eager to make a start in some fresh direction.

In Persia the purely mystic period had been left behind for some time before the definite emergence of the Ottoman dialect from amid the welter of local patois as the West-Turkish literary medium, and literature in that country was now in the hands of the lyric and romantic poets who gathered round the court of Huseyn Bayqará. At the head of the first of these groups stood ʿAlí Shír-i Newáʾí, the heir and successor of Háfiz, a writer distinguished alike in poetry and prose, and equal master of Persian and his native Jaghatay or Eastern Turkish. The second group was under the leadership of the famous poet Jámí. The influence of these two illustrious men of letters remained supreme in Persia for nearly a hundred years, not being seriously affected till ʿUrfí and Feyzí introduced a new style and taste towards the close of the sixteenth century.

All was therefore ready for the advent of Ottoman poetry; the formative forces at work during the First Period had fitted the West-Turkish language to serve as a literary medium, had determined which of its dialects was to become this medium, and had trained it to follow easily and without effort the lead of its accepted guide. This guide had now entered a region where the literary and æsthetic cravings of the age were recognised and answered; so there was nothing wanting but the man of destiny, the man who by discovering, if not pursuing, the road for which all were groping, who by stammering, if not by singing, the words for which all were seeking, was to inaugurate the literature

of the Osmanic Empire and become the van-courier of the host of Ottoman poets.

The voice of the age cried aloud for a leader, and in response arose Ahmed Pasha. So it is with Ahmed Pasha that the history of Ottoman poetry proper begins. As with Shinásí Efendi in later times, so with Ahmed Pasha now, his real services were those of the pioneer, the intrinsic value of his work being comparatively slight. Vaguely conscious of an ideal which he could not clearly conceive, let alone express, Ahmed was stumbling along his way when, lo, out of the East came light, the light for which he and all his fellows were straining with eager gaze. When the ghazels sent by Newá'í to Constantinople came into the hands of Ahmed, his eyes were opened; he saw before him embodied in a form, fairer than which he could not picture, these very moods and fantasies which he and his companions had been vainly striving to express.

For a century and a half the movement thus begun flowed on without let or break; during this century and a half the poetry of Newá'í, either directly or through that of his Persian followers, was the main source of inspiration to the Ottoman lyric writers, as the works of Jámí and his imitators were to the Ottoman romancists. Now the style of Newá'í and Jámí, which was really but the culmination of a literary movement that had been in progress for three centuries in Persia, was remarkable for its lavish use of rhetorical embellishments of every description. This was the feature which most attracted the Ottoman poets and which they most strenuously endeavoured to reproduce in their own work. And so during this Second Period the chief aim of the Turkish poets was to decorate their verse with every imaginable variety of subtle and fantastic conceit, even at the expense, if need be, of grace of diction and beauty of thought.

It was therefore with the opening of this Period that the Ottoman literary idiom definitively broke away from the spoken form of the language and began its development upon entirely distinct and purely artificial lines.

This movement culminated in the work of the poet Báqí, very shortly after whose death in A. H. 1008 (A. D. 1600) there occurred a modification in the method and purpose of poetry so marked as to inaugurate a Third Period. About the middle of the sixteenth century the style of Newá'í and Jámí had been superseded in Persian literature by that elaborated by 'Urfí and Feyzí. The novelty in this style lay, apart from the introduction of a number of fresh terms into the conventional vocabulary of poetry, in the deposition of rhetoric from the chief seat and the enthronement of loftiness of tone and stateliness of language in its stead.

This was reflected in Ottoman poetry, especially in the writings of Nef'í whose work is the high-water mark of this particular school. It was, moreover, during this Period that the Persianisation of Ottoman poetry reached its extreme point. Many native Turkish words and phrases which had been preserved up to this time were now discarded and their places filled by Persian or Perso-Arabic equivalents; and while the poets had in the preceding Period frequently alluded to purely Ottoman customs or institutions, even though treating these in the Persian manner, it now became the fashion altogether to ignore such and deal exclusively with matters to be found in the pages of the Persian poets. To such a pitch was this Persianisation of poetry carried that there are many passages in the productions of this Period which might have been cut out bodily from some Persian poem.

The Third Period lasted till the end of the seventeenth century; but towards its close there appeared a poet, Nábí by name, who by skilfully grafting on to the current style the

peculiar didactic tone of the contemporary Persian poet Sá'ib, introduced a yet further modification into Ottoman poetry.

The Fourth Period, which covers the whole of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, is unlike the Second and Third Periods in that it is an age of eclecticism; there is no longer a single school including practically all the poets. The chief reason of this is that there was at that time no contemporary Persian poet of sufficient merit or eminence to command universal allegiance. The best that Persia could then show was the poet Shevket who is deservedly famous for his marvellous ingenuity and fertility in the invention of fresh and picturesque images and similes. For more than half a century this writer continued to be the guiding star for the majority of Ottoman poets. The work that these men produced was for the most part an amalgam of the style of Nábí with that of Shevket; its tone is didactic like that of the former, while it relies for decoration on a new and quaint imagery modelled upon that of the latter. These poets who looked to Shevket as their master were the last followers of the old tradition which taught the writers of Turkey to turn to contemporary Persia for guidance; and after their time Ottoman poetry ceases to reflect that of the eastern kingdom.

All along — though more especially during the sixteenth century — there had been sporadic outbursts of the national spirit in Ottoman poetry; the Persian forms had indeed always been respected, but from time to time the voice of the native genius had striven to speak through these. The most notable of such occasions was when the poet Sábit had at the end of the seventeenth century made the first determined effort to stem the overwhelming flood of Persianism and convert Turkish poetry into a somewhat truer interpreter of the Turkish mind. From his day, all through the first stage of

the Fourth Period, the movement to which he had given so great an impulse continued to gather strength, till in the latter half of the eighteenth century it became sufficiently powerful to be the dominant motive in Ottoman poetry for some fifty years. This change marks the second of the three stages of the Fourth Period. The movement which brought this about had its origin in revolt, revolt against the traditional Persianism; but with success revolt very speedily developed into license. There was nothing to guide or control the new spirit thus suddenly advanced to a foremost place. It knew not how to speak save in the terms of Persian poetry, so it spoke in these while it defied them; it knew not of what to speak save the themes of the Persianists, so it spoke of these while it made light of them. The typical poetry of this stage truly reflects the genius neither of Turkey nor of Persia; what it displays is a struggle between the two, a struggle which while it lasted entailed anarchy. Had there been any guide to direct the national spirit, it must have triumphed; for it was full of vigour while Persianism was decrepit; but the latter, though it had no living champion, had behind it five centuries of culture, and thus it was able by the sheer dead-weight of the past to stifle for the time its rival's efforts at emancipation.

And so with the early years of the nineteenth century there came a recrudescence of Persianism; but as there was now no contemporary Persian master, not even a Shevket, whom the poets could follow, for the next thirty or forty years there was not properly speaking any school, each poet choosing as guide or model whichever writer of former times appealed most strongly to his individual taste. These years of uncertainty form the third and last stage of the Fourth Period; and with them the history of the Old School of Ottoman poetry comes to a close.

It is usual to disparage the Fourth Period, to speak of it as an age of decline; and so in many respects, especially from the Persianist point of view, it unquestionably is. On the other hand, as it includes the one sustained attempt to dominate literary poetry made by the native genius without any guidance from outside, it yields in interest to few epochs in the history of this poetry.

At no time had Ottoman poetry appeared in so hopeless a plight as during the last years of the Old School. Persia, stricken with intellectual paralysis, was no longer able to act as guide; the effort of the Turkish poets to supply from within what had thus failed from without had ended in disaster; and poetry seemed to have fallen into a Chinese stagnation of lifeless conventionalism with neither wish nor power save to mumble the dry bones of a long-dead culture. Such was the position when at the end of the sixth decade of the nineteenth century Shinásí Efendi bade the vivifying spirit of the West breathe for the first time into the worn-out frame of Ottoman poetry. By the production in 1859 of a little volume of translations from the French poets into Turkish verse this author opened the eyes of his more thoughtful countrymen to the fact that there was a literature worthy of study outside the realms of Islam, and in this manner prepared the way for a revolution the results of which have been beyond compare more momentous and farther-reaching than those of any other movement by which Ottoman poetry has been affected.

The efforts of Shinásí Efendi to remodel literature after a Western pattern were ably and successfully seconded by his brilliant disciple Námiq Kemál Bey. But the work of these two distinguished reformers was practically confined to prose. No serious attempt was made to apply their principles to poetry till the year 1296 (1879) when ʿAbd-ul-Haqq

Hámid Bey published his epoch-making Sahrá or 'The Country.'[1] This tiny booklet of but fifty-nine pages contains ten poems composed in Western verse-forms and treating their subject in a simple, natural, Western fashion, — the first original Turkish poems written in this style.[2] The direction suggested by this book was at once recognised by the more talented among the younger poets as that in which salvation must be sought, with the result that there now began a steady flow of poetry written on the lines of the Sahrá, and consequently absolutely unlike anything which had gone before. As a matter of course the new movement was at first violently opposed by the adherents of the old system. But the result of the struggle was never for a moment doubtful; moribund Persianism might fret and fume for a few years, but that it could offer any effectual resistance to the strong fresh spirit that was inspiring with new life the intellectual world was inconceivable. It is now just twenty years since the first note of the new poetry was sounded, and within this brief period the whole aspect of things has changed. Where there seemed to lie the apathy of death there is now busy hopeful life; torpor and stagnation have given place to progress; for short as has yet been its life, the New School has passed through more than one stage.

Although Turkish poetry owes this marvellous transformation to the influence of the West, the position of the New School towards Western poetry is very different from that of the Old School towards Persian. The aim of the

[1] Hámid Bey is at present (1899) Councillor to the Ottoman Embassy in London.

[2] Four years before this, in 1292 (1875), Hámid Bey had indeed published some incidental verses in the European style in a prose drama entitled Dukhter-i Hindú or 'The Indian Maid.' These verses are actually the first original Turkish poetry in the Western manner; but they seem to have been overlooked by the public, as it was not till after the issue of the Sahrá that Europeanised poetry came into vogue.

old poets was to write what was practically Persian poetry, and that as far as possible in Persian words. The object of the new poets has not been to write Western poetry, nor yet to stud their verses with foreign terms; they have not turned to the West to learn what to think, but to learn how to think. They have studied the attitude of the Western poet's mind as displayed in his work, and they have themselves endeavoured to assume a similar mental attitude. Thus they have found that the Western poet seeks to describe the things which he sees about him and to express his own feelings in regard to these, so they likewise have tried to describe things that have come under their own eyes and to tell the emotions that these have awakened in their own breasts. As a consequence Turkish poetry has become for the first time natural and personal.

But this is not all; by leading the Turk straight to nature, to nature on which at the bidding of the Persian he turned his back six hundred years ago, the West has unconsciously, but none the less effectively, opened the way for a poetry which is truly Turkish. A century before, when the genius of the nation had grappled with and for a moment got the better of its ancient taskmaster, it had failed to profit by its victory, for it had not known what to make of it. But what was wanting then is forthcoming now; a trusty guide has pointed out the road; the Turkish poet has learned at last that his true duty is to copy neither the Persian nor the Frank, but to interpret the heart of the Turkish people; and that to perform this duty aright, he must study, not the díwáns or the dramas of foreign writers, but the lights and shadows, the joys and sorrows, that make up the daily life of the humble and simple among his own fellow-countrymen. [1]

[1] Early in the present year 1316 (1899) a little volume of verses entitled Turkje Shi'rlar or 'Turkish Poems,' was published by Mehemmed Emín Bey,

The change from the Old to the New School must have come sooner or later; the Europeanisation of every department of Turkish life which had been in progress for years rendered it inevitable. But this does not alter the fact that the man who directly brought about this great and beneficial change is and must ever remain the central figure in the history of Ottoman poetry. The work of Hámid Bey forms the turning-point in this history; everything composed before he wrote bears in one form or another the mark of Persia, everything worthy of the name of poetry composed since he has written shows directly or indirectly the influence of Europe. No man of our generation has, as far as I know, so profoundly influenced the literary destinies of a nation as has this illustrious poet and reformer. [1]

The extraordinary enthusiasm with which this change was welcomed and the signal success with which, despite manifold discouragements from official quarters, it has been crowned, show how willing is the Turkish people, for all its innate loyalty to tradition, to accept beneficial reform and how able to profit by it. In the wide and complex question of reforming the institutions of the country, it is probably in this one particular alone, namely the reform of literature, that the Turkish people has had an absolutely free hand. Here and here alone foreign intriguer and domestic revolutionary have been unable to carry out their baleful programme of thwarting every effort at amelioration. Had the Turks, when the opportunity was presented to them, shown themselves unwilling or unable to carry out this vital

in which the first attempt is made to present in literary form the real speech and feelings of the great body of the Turkish people. In these little poems, put into the mouths of common soldiers and Anatolian peasants, the true voice of the Turkish people speaks for the first time in literature.

[1] Hámid Bey followed up his Sahrá with a number of brilliant lyric and dramatic works which I hope to describe in detail in a later volume.

reform in the one sphere which they wholly controlled, where neither Russian emissary nor Armenian anarchist could enter to blight the tender promise ere it could gather strength, then would the judgment of their traducers have been justified, and they would have proved themselves to friend and foe alike a race whose vital energy was spent. But since, on the contrary, nothwithstanding the alien source whence it was derived, they have welcomed with open arms this great, this revolutionary change in a province rendered sacred by the continuous tradition of near six hundred years; and have welcomed it, moreover, solely because they were satisfied of its superiority, without a thought of the impression their action might produce upon the outside world which is as ignorant of the progress of intellectual life in Turkey as it is of what may be developing in Mercury or Mars; and as they have applied it with such thoroughness that there is as great a difference between the language and spirit of a Turkish book of to-day and one of but fifty years ago as there is between the poetry of Tennyson and that of Chaucer, we are constrained to admit that the mental energy of this people is unimpaired, and that those who have so glibly doomed it as plunged in a lethargy from which there is no awakening, as stricken with a paralysis from which there is no recovery, have but shown once more how worthless is the judgment that is based upon ignorance and prejudice.

BOOK II

THE FIRST PERIOD.

A. D. 1300 — A. D. 1450.

[There are no contemporary records for the First Period. The earliest Tezkires or Dictionaries of the Poets[1] date from the middle of the sixteenth century, that of Sehí Bey, the oldest of all,[2] having been written only a very few years before Latífí's, which was finished in 953 (1546-7).[3] ʿAshiq Chelebi's Tezkire was completed in 976 (1568-9),[4] Qinali-záde Hasan Chelebi's in 994 (1586),[5] while that of Riyází — the last to deal with the whole field of Ottoman poetry — was compiled as late as 1018 (1609-10).[6] Tash-köprizáde's biographical work on eminent dervish sheykhs and members of the ʿulemá, which bears the title of Shaqáyiq-un-Nuʿmániya or 'The Crimson Peony,' was written in 965 (1558),[7] and ʿAlí Efendi's general history called

[1] A biographical dictionary of the poets is called Tezkiret-ush-Shuʿará or 'Dictionary of the Poets.' In these works the names of the poets are entered in alphabetical order, and as a rule each entry contains, besides the biographical notice of the poet, a short criticism on his style, etc., and a few examples of his work. There are several of these Tezkires in Turkish.

[2] Sehí's book has not been printed, nor, as far as I know, is there any MS. in England. It would appear, however, to contain little or nothing that has not been embodied in the later Tezkires.

[3] Latífí's Tezkire was printed at the office of the Iqdám newspaper in 1314 (1898). There is a MS. in the British Museum (Add. 17,339), another in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society, and another in my collection. From the letter ص this last offers a different (and apparently later) recension of the text from that of either of the other two MSS. or of the printed edition.

[4] ʿAshiq's Tezkire has not yet been printed; there is a MS. in my collection. The word Chelebi that follows his name is merely a title signifying 'Master.'

[5] Qinali-záde Hasan's Tezkire is likewise still unprinted; there are three MSS. in the British Museum (Add. 24,957: Or, 35: Add. 19,622), one in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society, and one in my collection. Most European writers, following Von Hammer, speak of this biographer by his family name Qinali-záde; the Turks generally call him Hasan Chelebi; I prefer to follow them.

[6] Riyází's work also is unprinted; there is a MS. in my collection.

[7] 'The Crimson Peony' was originally written in Arabic. There are several Turkish translations. The best-known is that of Mejdí, which was made in 995 (1587); it is this version, which was printed in 1269 (1852-3), that I have followed in the present work.

Kunh-ul-Akhbár or 'The Essence of Histories' in 1007 (1598-9).[1] Belígh's Guldeste-i Riyáz-i ʿIrfán or 'Posy from the Bowers of Culture,' which contains the lives of men of distinction connected with the city of Brusa, is more modern still, having been finished in 1135 (1722).[2] All these books start from the foundation of the Empire and carry the series of biographies down to the time of compilation. They form the chief sources of our information concerning the lives of the poets of the First Period, and in view of the remoteness of even the earliest among them from the times when these poets lived, it is not unlikely that their stories concerning them are in great measure traditional. For the rest, in most cases the more important works of these early poets are in our hands, and so we are fairly equipped to deal with the literary history of this far-off period, even if the figures among whom we move be somewhat vague and shadowy.]

[1] Part of ʿAlí's History has been printed; the greater part of the unprinted portion, that which deals with events between the capture of Constantinople and the death of Suleymán I, is contained in two MSS. preserved in the British Museum (Add. 10,004: Or. 32).

[2] Belígh's work was printed at Brusa in 1302 (1884-5).

CHAPTER I.

The Early Mystics.

Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín. Sultán Veled. Yúnus Imre. ʿÁshiq Pasha.

The year 1300 of the Christian era, that wherein the Seljúq Kingdom ceased to exist, may be regarded as the birth-year of the Ottoman Empire. Nearly a century had elapsed since Suleymán Sháh had sought refuge in the west, and during that time his son and grandson had done good service to their Seljúq patrons as wardens of the Bithynian marches against the officers of the Cæsars. But neither Er-Toghrul nor ʿOsmán had ever sought independence for himself; they had been content to remain loyal vassals of the suzerain power, which, on its part, had never failed to treat them with honour and generosity; and it was only when the Seljúq Empire was no more and ʿOsmán found himself without a lord, that he arose and fought for his own hand.

Out of the chaos which resulted from the Mongol invasion and the Seljúq downfall there emerged in Asia Minor the ten little Turkish kingdoms already mentioned as constituting the West-Turkish Decarchy. The names of those little states and of the ancient provinces to which they roughly corresponded are: 1. ʿOsmán (Phrygia Epictetus with a portion of Bithynia wrested from the Greeks); 2. Qarasi (Mysia);

3. Kermiyan [1] (Phrygia): 4. Hamíd (Pisidia and Isauria); 5. Tekke (Lycia and Pamphylia); 6. Saru-Khan; 7. Aydin (together Lydia); 8. Menteshe (Caria); 9. Qizil-Ahmedli [2] (Paphlagonia); 10. Qaraman (Lycaonia). [3]

Thus at the outset the Ottoman is but one, and that the least in extent, of a number of petty Turkish kingdoms sprung up from the ruins of the Seljúq or old West-Turkish Empire. But its rulers and people being the most enterprising and adventurous, it gradually gathered in the others, until we find about a century and a half after the Seljúq collapse that there is again but a single Turkish state in Asia Minor, though the supreme power is now in the hands of the Ottoman Sultan. This reconsolidation of the Turkish power would have occurred earlier had not Timur's invasion at the beginning of the fifteenth century thrown everything into confusion and retarded matters for fifty years.

Now in the regions forming these little kingdoms several Turkish dialects were spoken. These dialects were all variations of the Western branch of the Turkish tongue and did not materially differ from one another, though each had certain words and grammatical forms peculiar to itself. They were one and all perfectly intelligible to every Western Turk; there was therefore no reason why a poet in the days of the Decarchy should write in any other than that of his own province. And so we find that poets and other men of letters, born outside the Ottoman borders, whether they remained subject to their native prince or passed into the Ottoman service, made exclusive use of the Turkish of their own district.

[1] Several authorities write this name Germiyan.

[2] Sometimes called Isfendyárli.

[3] To the east was a welter of Turkman hordes, from out of which there emerged later on several local Turkish kingdoms, three of which maintained their independence in face of the Ottomans for over a century.

This state of things lasted for about a century and a half; and it was only when all the nine kingdoms had been finally gathered in, and Constantinople won by the Ottoman Sultan for the capital of the renovated West-Turkish Empire, that the Ottoman dialect, modified no doubt to a certain extent by those of the neighbouring provinces, became the sole recognised literary medium for the whole West-Turkish world. Up till that time each poet made use of his own native dialect; there was no single idiom accepted by all. Consequently comparatively few of the works produced during this century and a half which we have called the First Period are written in the true Ottoman dialect.

Nevertheless it would be wrong to pass over these in silence as certain modern Ottoman writers do; because even though they are written in old provincial dialects, they form the foundation upon which the more strictly Ottoman literature that followed has been reared. It may perhaps be said that such works cannot accurately be classed under the head of Ottoman poetry, that West-Turkish poetry would be a more correct designation; and from a philological point of view this would be true. All the same, these works are practically Ottoman; the majority of them were written in the Ottoman dominions for Ottoman patrons in dialects which differ less from the Ottoman than those of the English counties do from one another. Moreover, as they form the basis of the subsequent Ottoman poetry, without some knowledge of them we should be unable to trace satisfactorily the gradual development of sentiment and style in that poetry. We shall therefore take all the more prominent of these early writers just as though they had been Ottomans in the most restricted sense, and examine their works as fully as the materials at our disposal will allow.

During the woeful years immediately preceding the birth of the Ottoman power, when Western Asia was one vast battle-field where hostile races and rival dynasties struggled for existence or fought for pre-eminence, the Persian sun was standing high in the heaven of poetry, and the Eastern world was bright with the glory of that radiance the reflection of which lingers to this day. Some century and a half before, mysticism had triumphed over the more realistic spirit of earlier times, and now claimed as its own the whole field of contemporary Persian poetry. And in most quarters side by side with mysticism, even at this early period, reigned artificiality. The grandiose but obscure and affected qasídas of Anvarí [1] and Zahír-ud-Dín-i Fáryábí [2] were looked upon as the crowning glory of lyric poetry, for the ghazel had not yet attained that predominant position which, thanks chiefly to the genius of Háfiz, it was afterwards to hold. Nizámí [3] had brilliantly inaugurated the mystic-romantic poetry

[1] Anvarí, who died in 587 (1191-2), is considered by many to have carried the Persian qasída to its highest point of perfection.

[2] Zahír-ud-Dín-i Fáryábí died in 598 (1201-2). His qasídas were held in high esteem by his contemporaries, some of whom placed them before those of Anvarí. He is frequently mentioned by the early Turkish writers, always in terms of respect and admiration.

[3] Nizámí of Genje was born in 535 (1140·1) and died in 598 (1201-2) or 599 (1202-3). His Khamsa or 'Quintet' contains these five mesnevís: Makhzen-ul-Esrár or 'The Treasury of Secrets,' 'Khusrev and Shírín,' 'Leylí and Mejnún,' Heft-Peyker or 'The Seven Effigies,' and the Iskender-Náme or 'Book of Alexander.' 'The Treasury of Secrets' is a didactic-mystic work in which the author discusses a number of questions bearing on conduct, each of which he elucidates by the addition of some appropriate anecdote. Works of this description became very popular both in Persia and Turkey. The 'Khusrev and Shírín' and the 'Leylí and Mejnún' are romances on famous love-stories. 'The Seven Effigies' is a romance on the adventures of King Behrám-i Gúr and his lady-loves. 'The Book of Alexander' consists of two parts, of which the first is sometimes called the Sheref-Náme or 'Book of Glory' or the Iqbál-Náme or 'Book of Fortune,' and the second the Khired-Náme or 'Book of Wisdom;' it deals with the romantic history of Alexander the Great. As these books were afterwards reproduced in Turkish, we shall examine their subjects more closely farther on.

of the East; and in his famous Khamsa, the work, or rather series of works, destined to arouse to emulation so many both in his own and other lands, were displayed — nowhere more clearly — the two chief tendencies of the age. For the Khamsa was written at the very time when the qasída was being stifled under every species of decoration, and it reflects in many and many a far-fetched metaphor and recondite allusion that passion for the artificial and ostentatious which had now established its tyranny over Persian poetry. Again, Nizámí was the first romantic poet after the universal triumph of mysticism, and thus his stories are no longer, as in former times, romances pure and simple, but are all more or less allegoric in intention and mystic in spirit.

But mightier than either lyric or romancist was he under whose shadow both were fain to sing. The mystic poet, the master who elected verse as the channel for his transcendental teaching, was lord-paramount wherever Persian culture held; and nowhere was his power more absolute or his influence more profound than in this very Asia Minor. For here in Qonya, the Seljúq capital, had been established for over fifty years the head-quarters of a group of saintly mystics who by the power of their writings and the spell of their personality have exercised an incalculable influence upon the subsequent literature and philosophy of the Muslim East. Hither, while yet a youth, had the greatest of them all, the Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín, [1] been brought by his father Behá-ud-Dín Veled; here had he lived and taught; here had he seen those visions and worked those signs which Eflákí [2]

[1] Mevláná (in Arabic, 'Our Lord') is a title prefixed to the names of great dervish sheykhs and eminent members of the ᶜulemá.

[2] Eflákí, who was a disciple of Jelál's grandson Chelebi Emír ᶜArif, wrote at the request of his teacher a biographical work on the early Mevleví fathers, which he called Menáqib-ul-ᶜArifín or 'The Acts of the Adepts.' A number of translated extracts from this work, which was completed in 754 (1353),

has collected for us with such loving care; and above all here had he written his marvellous Mesneví.[1] This great poem, one of the greatest and most noble in all Persian literature, which in clear, simple language, but without apparent order or method, discourses on the doctrines and aspects of the mystic philosophy, has for ages formed the text-book of the Súfí thinker from the shores of the Mediterranean to the Wall of China. Scarcely less important has been the influence of the impassioned Díwán where in inspired strains the poet-saint sings of the mystic Love, and immortalises his dear master Shems-ud-Dín of Tebríz.[2] Here too in Qonya had the Mevláná founded that famous dervish-order,[3] called after him the Mevleví, which in later years became so powerful, and which centuries afterwards gave to Turkey one of her greatest poets.[4]

Unlike the contemporary lyric and romantic poets, Jelál and the other mystic teachers, both in Qonya and elsewhere, wrote in a simple and straightforward style, eschewing the tricks and artifices wherewith the court poets bedecked their works. These men were too much in earnest to play with words; moreover, they were less artists in language, or even

are prefixed to Sir J. W. Redhouse's translation of the First Book of the Mesneví (Trübner, 1881).

[1] The full title of this famous book is Mesneví-i Maᶜneví or 'The Spiritual Couplets;' but it is usually styled simply The Mesneví, as being the Mesneví among all mesnevís.

[2] A selection of ghazels from Jelál's Díwán along with translations and valuable critical notes has been published by Mr. R. A. Nicholson under the title of 'Selected Poems from the Dīvāni Shamsi Tabrīz' (Cambridge University Press, 1898.)

[3] The so-called 'dancing dervishes' are members of this order. The mystic dance which certain among them perform every week was instituted by Jelál himself who describes it in more than one poem in his Díwán, where he represents it as symbolic of the universal life with its movements multiplex yet one.

[4] Sheykh Ghálib.

poets singing because they must, than masters who chose to teach in verse rather than in prose, the former being more in harmony with the spirit of the time and better suited to the matter they had to say.

The influence then of Jelál-ud-Dín and the mystics held the first place in the age and in the country wherein Turkish poetry was destined to start upon its course, while that of the lyric and romantic writers occupied the second. The effects of this are immediately evident; the earliest Turkish poetry consists of long mystic or theological mesnevís written in a plain and simple fashion with little attempt at embellishment or literary grace of any kind. Later on, when the immediate personal influence of the master and his band has somewhat faded, a change occurs; lyric and romantic poetry, and with them artificiality, begin to be cultivated with the greater assiduity, while mysticism as a formal subject of poetry falls into the second place, though remaining as the foundation and background of the whole.

It is just after the close of the fourteenth century that this change becomes clearly evident. The disastrous invasion of Timur, which occurred at the very beginning of the fifteenth century, cuts the First Period into two divisions, the poetry produced during the first of these being not only the more single-minded in purpose and the more artless and naïve in expression, but also far the more Turkish in its manner and diction. Whether it be, as seems more probable, the natural result of a century of culture, or whether it be in any degree owing, as the historian ʿÁlí would infer, to the influence of the Persian scholars who came into Asia Minor in Timur's train, the West-Turkish poetry written about the time of the Tartar onslaught becomes somewhat suddenly much more Persian and much more artificial. The simple homely language of the earlier poets with their old-fashioned

'finger-counting,' suggestive of the ancient folk-songs and ballads, gives place to high-sounding foreign words and to the laboured rules of Persian prosody. Ingenious allegories begin to supersede the earnest if somewhat tedious homilies of the early followers of Jelál, and tricks of language and curiosities of imagery gradually replace the old straightforward speech.

Although he lived full half a century in a Turkish city, and for that same reason is known throughout the East by the surname of Rúmí [1] — a term which practically means the (Western-) Turk — Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín, for all his splendid literary ability, did virtually nothing towards the great work of founding Turkish literature. His Mesneví-i Maʿneví contains between 25,000 and 30,000 couplets, but there is never a Turkish line among them; there are in his vast Díwán 1,000,000 distichs, yet there is not one single ghazel written wholly in the Turkish tongue. Some time ago a scholarly member of the Mevleví order, Veled Chelebi by name, made a careful examination of the master's works for the express purpose of discovering to what extent he had made use of the Turkish language; and the only reward of this labour of love was one complete ghazel of the description known as Mulemmaʿ written in mingled Turkish and Persian, together with three Persian ghazels each of which

[1] Rúm is an Oriental form of Rome. The names 'Greece' and 'Greek' are unknown: Yúnán represents Ionia. So powerfully did the Roman conquest of Greece and Asia Minor affect the Asiatic mind that to the Orientals not only all the subsequent, but all the former movers in these lands have ever since been 'Romans.' Thus Alexander the Great is known throughout the East as Iskender-i Rúmí 'Alexander the Roman;' while all the later dwellers in these regions, Byzantines, Seljúqs and Ottomans, have likewise been indiscriminately called Rúmís, that is 'Romans;' and their emperor, Christian or Muslim, is the Qaysar-i Rúm or 'Cæsar of Rome.' And so the Ottoman Empire is, and has always been, styled the 'Roman Empire,' or simply 'Rome,' by Persians, Tartars, Afghans and Indians; an Ottoman Turk is called by these a 'Roman,' and the Ottoman language, the 'Roman language.' The name Rúm is thus virtually a geographical term and represents the territories ruled in succession by Roman, Byzantine, Seljúq and Ottoman; and it is in this sense that it is used in Persian and literary Turkish. The name Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín-i Rúmí therefore means etymologically 'Our Lord Jelál-ud-Dín the Roman (or, of Rome),' but practically, 'Our Lord Jelál-ud-Dín the Seljúq Turk (or, of Seljúq Turkey).'

contains a few Turkish distichs, and one or two other ghazels with a single Turkish couplet apiece. [1]

Jelál-ud-Dín was born in Balkh in Central Asia in 604 (1207-8), and died in Qonya in 672 (1273-4), so those few lines are our earliest specimens of West-Turkish verse.

Veled Chelebi quotes as examples the two following fragments. The passages which in the original are in Persian are italicised in the translation.

Fragment of a Ghazel. [1]

Or good or ill the brother be, indeed he
Upon a long and toilsome road will lead thee. [2]

The shepherd clutch thou fast, the wolves are many;
O my black lamb, O my black lambkin, heed me! [3]

And be thou Turk, or be thou Greek, or Persian,
The tongue of those the tongueless learn, I rede thee! [4]

Fragment of a Ghazel. [2]

Thou know'st how out of all folk I love thee and thee only;
If to my breast thou come not, for grief shall I die lonely.

I fain one day were seated alone beside thee, dearest,
Then would I learn me Turkish [5] and quaff the wine full pronely.

[1] See an article entitled Edebíyát-i Islámíya or 'Muslim Literature' by Mehemmed Veled Chelebi in the special number of the journals Terjumán-i Haqíqat and Servet-i Funún published in aid of the destitute Muhammedans of Crete in 1313 (1897).

[2] The office of him who is to be thy brother on the mystic journey is arduous and vital, so it behoves thee to choose him with the utmost care.

[3] Quzum 'my lamb' is a common form of familiar address among all classes in Turkey; but 'my black lamb,' if used at all now, must be provincial.

[4] 'The tongueless,' i. e. those who are wrapt in silent contemplation of the Divinity, who have reached that stage where speech is not only inadequate but is misleading.

[5] i. e. 'I would learn thy language so as to entertain thee.' So at least Veled Chelebi explains the words: —

هم مین چاغیر ایچرمین هم مین. قابیس بیلیرمین

The Turkish cause owes more to Jelál-ud-Dín's son Sultán Veled. This son, whose full name was Sultán Veled Beha-ud-Dín Ahmed, was born in the Seljúq city of Larende,[1] in 623 (1226), when his father was only nineteen years of age. His youth was spent in the service of some of the greatest Súfí teachers of the time, such as Burhán-ud-Dín of Tirmíz, Shems-ud-Dín of Tebríz and Saláh-ud-Dín Ferídún of Qonya, the last-mentioned of whom gave him his daughter Fátima in marriage. In his Lives of the Súfí Saints, entitled Nefahát-ul-Uns or 'The Breaths of Intimacy,'[2] Jámí, the great Persian poet, tells us that when Sultán Veled grew up, he became so like his father that those who did not know them used to take the two for brothers. Jelál-ud-Dín, who died in 672 (1273-4), was, according to Eflákí, succeeded by Sheykh Husám-ud-Dín, who had till then acted as his vicar. On the death of this person in 683 (1284), the generalship of the order passed to Sultán Veled,[3] who continued to expound his father's teachings in what the biographers describe as clear and graceful language till he died, at the age

[1] Larende is the old name of the town Qaraman; it is still used in official documents.

[2] The 'Intimacy' alluded to in this title is that between God and the mystic.

[3] The generalship of the Mevleví order is still in the family of Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín. The General bears the special title of Chelebi Efendi. The headquarters of the order are and ever have been at Qonya. The mausoleum of Jelál in that city is a beautiful building surmounted by a dome which is covered with blue tiles. The mausoleum is consequently famous throughout the Muslim world as the Qubbe-i Khazrá or 'Green Dome.' As we shall have frequent occasion to remark, the Easterns do not regard blue and green as distinct colours, but merely as different shades or tints of one colour.

of eighty-six, on the 10th. Rejeb, 712 (11th. November, 1312).

Amongst other works in Persian verse wherein he comments and discourses upon his father's teaching, Sultán Veled left a mesneví poem bearing the name of Rebáb-Náme or 'The Book of the Rebeck.' In the hundredth section of the first part of this Book of the Rebeck there is a series of one hundred and fifty-six couplets in the Seljúq dialect of Turkish, — the earliest important specimen of West-Turkish poetry that we possess. Through the presence of these Turkish verses this otherwise undistinguished book acquires a great and unique interest, for here, enshrined in its pages, it holds the first serious utterance of the new literature.

The composition of the book which thus curiously, and as it were by accident, comes to be the starting-point of West-Turkish poetry, synchronises almost exactly with the birth of the Ottoman state. It was written within the space of four months in the year 700 (1301). The poem, the purpose of which is purely mystic, owes its name to a panegyric on the musical instrument called the Rebáb or 'Rebeck' with which it opens, much as the Mesneví of Jélal-ud-Dín begins with the eulogy of the Reed-Flute. What induced the author to break through all precedent, write a series of verses in the Turkish language, and incorporate these in a Persian mesneví, we cannot say. But Sultán Veled seems to have had a fancy for versifying in various tongues, as Professor Vámbéry discovered in this same Rebáb-Náme a series of twenty-two couplets in the Greek language though written in Persian characters.[1] This is yet more extraordinary; Turkish, though not then a literary language, was at least the speech of a Muhammedan people, while Greek

[1] Professor Vámbéry announced his discovery of these Greek verses in a letter to the Athenæum of January 7th, 1888. Veled Chelebi says that Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín also has some verses in Greek.

was the tongue of a nation outside the Muslim pale. But Sultán Veled was a Súfí, not a Muslim of the orthodox type; and to the Súfí all religions are more or less good, as all are roads leading to The Truth, though some may be shorter or more direct than others; and so considerations which would at once have determined a member of the ʿulemá might have had little enough weight with him.

The Rebáb-Náme is written in the same metre as Jelál-ud-Dín's Mesneví and in this metre — of course one of the regular Persian varieties — are the Turkish couplets; but in these the feet are generally, though not invariably, syllabic according to the true Turkish fashion. In a few cases they are quantitative; and thus we see here, in the very first piece of Western Turkish verse, the beginning of that struggle between the native and the Persian systems of prosody which characterises the earlier part of the First Period. The vocabulary too is very Turkish, containing but few Arabic or Persian words, far fewer than we meet with in even slightly later works. Many of the Turkish words employed are now obsolete; some probably never existed in the Ottoman dialect, others perhaps still linger on in some provincial patois. Looked at merely with regard to the language, these verses are of great interest, as in them we have a specimen of the Turkish of Western Asia at the time when the Ottoman Empire was being founded.

Sultán Veled is one of those men whom I have described as being less a poet than a mystic teacher who taught through verse. There is therefore in these Turkish couplets no attempt at literary grace of any kind. They are written in correct enough metre in the Turkish fashion, and the lines rhyme with sufficient accuracy, and that is all. There is an entire absence of anything that is merely decorative, nor is there any slightest hint of that torrent of fantastic similes and

remote allusions which is by and by to overwhelm this poetry. The writer does not trouble himself even to avoid repetition; he uses the same words and phrases over and over again, without thinking or caring to vary them. The poverty of the language may perhaps go for something here; but the true cause is the earnestness of the teacher. His great object is to say what he has to say in the clearest and directest way he can. And here he is certainly successful; for once the merely external difficulty of his old-fashioned dialect is overcome, his style is singularly easy.

In one place Sultán Veled speaks as though his acquaintance with the Turkish language were limited; he says: —

'Knew I Turkish, unto you I should make known
'All the secrets that the Lord to me hath shown.'

Here he can mean only that he did not write Turkish verse with the same facility as Persian; for his work is before us to prove that he possessed an excellent knowledge of the Turkish language, as indeed it would be strange had he not, seeing that he passed all his life in a Turkish country.

The theme of Veled's Turkish verses is of course the mystic philosophy. Even in this comparatively short passage of one hundred and fifty-six couplets we can see very clearly that truly Oriental discursiveness so characteristic not alone of the writer and his illustrious father, but of almost every poet of the mystic school. The author takes up a point, makes a few observations on it, and then passes to some fresh subject, to return ere long to the first, which is again abandoned and taken up without any perceptible line of thought being followed. Instead of presenting an orderly sequence of ideas leading up to some point which he desires to establish, the poet seems to put down whatever thought comes into his mind without considering its due relation to the context.

Thus Sultán Veled's Turkish couplets open with a few lines in praise of Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín, after which the writer proceeds to declare the superiority of his teaching over worldly riches; he then bids the reader implore God to show him the truth and to efface his individual existence even as the drop is lost in the sea. After a little the praise of the Mevláná is resumed, and we are told that the gifts of God to His saints differ in each case, but that none is equal to that vouchsafed to Jelál. We have next a list of the gifts bestowed on the Prophets of old; after which we are told not to regard God as other than His saints. We are then bidden resign our soul to God by whom we shall be repaid an hundred-fold. As when we are dreaming, the soul leaves the body and creates of itself a world, so shall it be when we die; but we must be careful to preserve our faith, which the soul will take along with it and which will form as it were its passport to Paradise. The poet touches next on the blessed state of the saint whose soul is alive through Love; we are enjoined to find out such an one and hold fast by him. Then we are told that if we would see the soul, we must look for it with soul as our eye; for every form of perceptible existence has an eye proper to perceive it, and this we must use, on the same principle as that only like can pair with like. After a further expatiation on the virtues of the man of God, we have the curious passage in which Sultán Veled says that if he knew Turkish he would impart all his knowledge to his readers, whom, he adds, he loves like a father, and for whose love he prays. He then bids us hold fast by him, as if we do not, where are we to go? We are again warned not to conceive of the saint as other than God, for he who sees one as two is squint-eyed. This identity of God with the saint who has found Him is dwelt on at some length and is buttressed by a

story, borrowed from the Mesneví, in which God, when speaking to Moses, identifies Himself with a holy man who has been ill, and in the clearest language declares Himself and His saints to be one. The reader is then called upon to renounce the world and be of those who have won to Truth; for such are in Paradise even while on earth, in the night do these see the sun, and in the darkness do they see the light; in the demon do they find the houri, and in blasphemy do they find true faith; they have died to themselves and are become one with God; like the drop they have fallen into the sea; but we must not call them drops, we must call them the Sea; and we must cleave fast to them and let all else go by.

If Sultán Veled really was the first — and we know of none before him — to seriously attempt literary poetry in the Western Turkish language, his success is marvellous. That his verses are little poetical is nothing to the point. It was no mean achievement to fashion from the rough dialect of camp and market-place a medium for the teaching of a spiritual philosophy. To do this, moreover, almost exclusively from native elements, with such little assistance from the more cultivated languages he knew so well, proves the poet to have been as resourceful as he was daring. Wonderful is the way in which the homely Turkish words fall so easily into their places in the smooth and even lines, just as though they had been long accustomed to such exercise, and no raw recruits drawn from city-street or country-side. And so well do they look standing marshalled there, that we cannot help regretting so many among them must ere long pass away to give place to substitutes levied from the Persians or the Arabs.

To Sultán Veled then belongs not only the honour due to the pioneer in every good work, but the credit which

is justly his who successfully accomplishes an arduous enterprise. To have inaugurated the poetry of a nation is an achievement of which any man might be proud.

The passages here translated from Sultán Veled's Turkish verses have been chosen as being representative of the series. [1]

From the Rebáb-Náme. [3]

Wot ye well Mevláná [2] is of saints the Pole; [3]
Whatsoever thing he sayeth, do in whole.
All his words are mercies from the Heavenly King;
Such that blind folks' eyes were opened, did they sing.
Whosoever by this Word doth tread the Way, [4] —
God vouchsafe to me the meed for him, I pray.
Mine are neither flocks nor riches to bestow,
That the love of Him through riches I should show.
These [5] the riches which the Lord hath granted me;
Whoso longeth for such riches, wise is he!

[1] The attention of Western scholars was first drawn to the Turkish verses in the Rebáb-Náme by Von Hammer who published the text and a German translation in 1829, in the 48th. vol. of the Jahrbücher der Literatur. Prof. Moriz Wickerhauser published a revised text (transliterated) and translation in the 20th. vol. of the Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft; while Dr. Behrnauer and Prof. Fleischer contributed some interesting and valuable notes on this revision to the 23rd. vol. of the same journal. In 1891 M. C. Salemann published, under the title of 'Noch Einmal die Seldschukischen Verse,' the text of the whole of the hundredth section, with a German translation, and, in an appendix, the Greek verses. The MS. from which M. Salemann printed this edition belongs to the Asiatic Museum of St. Petersburgh, and differs in some points from that preserved at Vienna, which contains the text used by the earlier editors.

[2] Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín, the poet's father.

[3] The Pole or Centre round which others revolve, or to which others are drawn. 'The Pole of Saints' is an honorific title, applied sometimes to others besides Jelál-ud-Dín.

[4] 'The Way' or 'the Path,' i. e. the mystic teaching that leads to absorption in God.

[5] i. e. these Words that point the Way of Life.

Words,[1] they form the riches of the man who 's wise;
All his riches giveth he, these Words he buys.
Riches, they are dust; these Words are life for aye;
Therefore flee the wise from those, in these to stay.
Words abide enduring, wealth departing flies;
Seize the living thing and leave thou that which dies!
Hold by God, that so thou mayst abide for aye;
Beg thou aidance of the Lord both night and day.
Praying, say to Him a-weeping dolefully:
'Through Thy grace divine do Thou have ruth on me;
'That I see Thee clearly, ope mine eyen wide;
'That I drop-like fall midmost the sea, and bide.
'E'en as when the drop into the sea doth run,
'Two they rest not, drop and sea become but one.
'So would I, e'en as that drop, become the sea;
'Die not, but e'en like the sea, alive would be!'
Mazed and wildered at these words the wise abide: —
'How then hath the creature the Creator spied?'[2]
'No man sees that Face,'[3] 'tis thus I answer these,
'It is his own self reflected that he sees.
'God the Lord doth give to him of His own Light,
'By that Light doth he the Lord God clearly sight.'[4]
So far may the letters hold the Verities;

[1] By 'Words' here and elsewhere in this and similar poems we must understand the idea or thought which is behind the uttered word and of which this is the expression; thought and word must be regarded as inseparable, as but two aspects of the same intellectual act; exactly as in the case of the Greek Logos, from which indeed the conception originally came.

[2] This line is the question of the 'wise' enquirers.

[3] The Face of God.

[4] In the text published by M. Salemann there here follow five couplets omitted in the Vienna MS. These are to the effect that if Light be in a man's eye, he doth see Light, and the Light of the sun cometh to him; for Light is one thing, and must not be regarded as two. So if Soul be in a man, he shall see Soul. Whatsoever is from thee is not from Him, though such things (i. e. as come from thee) be many in the world. Wisdom is necessary that one may see Wisdom: how should the fool, who hath no Wisdom, see it? Know this that thy (rational) wisdom cannot know Him, even as the soulless cannot see the soul. The central idea here is that like only can apprehend like, that in order to really understand anything, one must become

By these Words it is that soar aloft the wise,[1]
Understanding how 'tis God that seeth God,
How it is the Light of God that seeketh God!
* * * * * * * * * *
Leave thy wisdom, on this Path a madman be![2]
He who gives his soul, an hundred souls wins he.
Since the soul 's from God, to Him the soul restore;
He shall give thee many and many a soul therefor.
Sow the soul where it an hundred-fold shall bear;[3]
He who sows not there his soul shall evil fare.
See, thy soul, when thou 'rt asleep, where doth it flee?
See too what it worketh there[4] withouten thee.
From thy body, when thou sleep'st, the soul doth fleet
Bird-like, wheresoe'er it list, doth drink, doth eat;
Of itself a soul will myriad forms assume,
City, market-place, or shop will it become;
Of itself it will become the earth, the skies;
Wakeful is the soul, while there the body lies.
Know that thus will be thy soul when comes thy death.[5]
When thou yieldest up thy soul heed well thy faith,[6]

identified with it; and so to know God, one must be merged in God, become conscious of the Godhead in one's soul. The same idea occurs farther on in the poem.

[1] i. e. so far (but no farther) may the Verities be expressed by language; yet this account will point the wise the way to the higher Truths.

[2] The mystic, rapt and beside himself at the vision of Eternal Beauty, glories in describing himself as 'mad.'

[3] The figure here was probably suggested by this passage from the Koran, ii, 263: 'The likeness of those who expend their wealth in the way of God is as the likeness of a grain that groweth to seven ears, in every ear an hundred grains, for God will double unto whom He pleaseth; for God encompasseth and knoweth.'

[4] In dream-land.

[5] Compare Koran, xxxix, 43: 'God taketh souls at the moment of their death; and those that die not (He taketh) in their sleep; He restraineth those on whom He hath decreed death, and He sendeth back the others till their appointed term; — verily, in that are signs to a people who reflect.'

[6] The moment of death was considered peculiarly critical, the idea being that Satan appeared to the man just about to die and offered him a cup of water on condition of his recognising him as a God. Sa'dí alludes to this

That the soul may bear this [1] with it up to God,
And may walk with houris bright in Heaven's abode.
Happy yonder soul whose very soul is Love,
And whose service on this Path is naught but Truth!
Dead the loveless soul must needs be held, I say;
Needs must find one who a Lover [2] is straightway,
That he make the soul in thee alive through Love;
Ay, that through his radiance flee this darkness off;
That he make thee, e'en as he is, true and leal;
That he pardon through his mercy all thine ill.
Seek thou eager in the world for such an one,
Hold him fast and sure, and let all else be gone.
Such as hold him fast and sure, earth's Lords are they, —
Nay, it is through them that earth alive doth stay. [3]
Earth is as the body, as its soul such are.
Look within the body, where 's the soul? say, where?
All may see the body, none the soul may see;
Never asks the wise of how the soul may be.
Viewless is the soul, that eyes should see its face;
'Tis not body, that it stand in yonder place.
Leave this eye, [4] with Insight then the soul regard,
Even as thine understanding sees each word. [5]
Different eyes for every different thing there be;
Yea, thou hast an hundred eyes, and all do see.
Thus the ear is e'en the eye for speech, and well
Can the ear becoming speech from graceless tell.

near the end of the Bústán, where in a prayer, which he puts into the mou of a devotee, he implores God: —

که مارا درآن ورطهٔ یك نفس * ز تنك دو گفتن بفریاد رس

'In that vortex of the last breath
'Do Thou save me from the shame of saying Two!'

i. e. from confessing that there are two Gods.

[1] i. e. thy faith in the Unity.

[2] i. e. a mystic, one who is in love with the Divine Beauty. The 'Love is the mystic's favourite name for himself.

[3] i. e. it is by means of such holy ones that the spiritual life is preserv in the world.

[4] i. e. the bodily eye which is adapted to perceive material objects alone.

[5] Understanding is the eye adapted to see the thought lying behind words.

In the body is the mouth for taste the eye,
'Twixen sweet and bitter well can it descry.
Look on every thing then with the eye therefor,
That thou mayest see, nor fall afar forlore.
One must look upon the soul with soul for eyes.
Seekest soul? — then from the body must thou rise.
Glory seek'st? — turn Glory then for Glory's sake!
Houri seek'st? — turn Houri then for Houri's sake!
Well thou knowest horse doth ne'er with camel pair;
As the evil-worker hath not good for share. [1]

* * * * * * * * *

Knew I Turkish, unto you I should make known
All the secrets that the Lord to me hath shown;
With my words I'd make you know whate'er I know,
All that I have found I'd make you find, I trow.
Fain would I that all the folk this thing might see,
Yea, that all the poor should rich become through me;
That to all I might make known the things I know,
That both great and small might find my finding too!

* * * * * * * * * *

Seek thou God from him who doth His message bear;
Deem not such [2] is other than The Truth, [3] beware!
Hold thou fast by him who hath found God alway;
Neither when thou'st found him cry, 'Where 's God? I pray!'
Other is not God than he, ope thou thine eyes;
He it is who aye thy light to thee supplies. [4]
Whoso seeth one as two is squint of eye; [5]
Hearken not his speech, it is but trumpery.
Brother, whoso loves God from his heart, 'tis he

[1] This and the two foregoing couplets teach that man must identify himself with what he seeks; so if he seek the soul, he must eliminate the earthly and become all soul; a conception to which, as we have observed, the poet has already alluded.

[2] i. e. the messenger.

[3] The Truth, i. e. God.

[4] I here follow Salemann who conjecturally regards the obscure wo d أوروز as a corruption of the Persian روز taken in the sense of 'light,' rather than Fleischer who takes it to mean 'daily bread.'

[5] It was commonly believed that squint-eyed people see double.

Who will understand these Words e'en as they be:
Heaven and earth before his sight are one alone, —
All through God, without, within, One Secret shown!
One the speech, e'en though his words a myriad be;
From his speeches will an Eye come finally. [1]
All that is will die, the soul alone will bide;
In yon world the Slave [2] and Sultan, [3] naught beside:
One are Slave and Sultan there, they are not tway;
In that Palace Prince and Slave are One for aye!

* * * * * * * * * *

God to Moses said, [4] 'I have been sick indeed;
'Is it thus that one his loving friend should heed? [5]
'Great and small have come to see me, how I fare;
'How is it to ask of me thou camest ne'er?'
Moses said, 'Afar from Thee may sickness be!
'The Creator Thou, whence sickness then to Thee?'
'I've been sick, thou hast not come,' said God again,
'No account of what I told thee hast thou ta'en.'
Moses said, 'I may not read this mystery;
'What Thou meanest by this secret know not I.'
God made answer, 'Sick a saint of Mine hath been;
'There on earth My mad one suffered sickness' teen.
'How is it thou ne'er hast gone to see him there?
'Never asked his plight, nor said, "How dost thou fare?"
'For his sickness 'tis that I am sick e'en now.
'That I'm other than My saint, Oh, deem not thou!
'Whoso seeth him, he hath seen Me likewise;
'Whoso asks for him hath asked for Me likewise.
'See thou Me in him, and him in Me thou'lt see;
'Ask of Me from him, and ask of him from Me!'

* * * * * * * * * *

[1] However much and often the Lover speak, his real subject is always the same; and from his speeches there is at last developed an inward eye capable of perceiving The Truth.

[2] The Slave, i. e. the human soul.

[3] The Sultan, i. e. God.

[4] This legend, which occurs in the Ninth Story of the Second Book of the Mesneví offers a striking parallel to Matthew, xxv, 36-40.

[5] Does one show his regard for a friend by neglecting him when he is ill?

There are, according to Veled Chelebi, nine (apparently complete) ghazels besides several couplets in Turkish in Sultán Veled's Díwán which is about half the size of that of his father. The Chelebi quotes these two fragments as examples.

Fragment of a Ghazel. [4]

To-night a Radiance sheen hath filled thy dwelling,[1]
That thereinto the moonbeams bright are welling.

No more will darkness bide therein, for this Moon
Is through Its radiance darkness quite expelling.

And whether gone the thief or whether still there,
Will when the house is light be easy telling.

Fragment of a Ghazel. [5]

Come, for God's sake, come unto me that thou mayest God conceive!
Give up the world e'en this very day that thou mayest God receive!

What were thy head? give thou it up along with thy flocks on this Path!
Open thine eyes then, headless soul! that thou mayest God perceive![2]

Soar up to Heaven aloft, O my soul, if thou indeed be mine;
Open thy hand, give up thy wealth, that thou mayest God achieve!

[1] We may take the Radiance to be God, the dwelling to be the poet's heart, and the thief mentioned in the third couplet to be his ego or selfhood.

[2] By 'head' selfhood is meant; so in the language of the mystics 'headlessness' means self-annihilation, absorption into the Divine. Jelál-ud-Dín says in one of his ghazels: —

سر درکش ای رفیق که هنکام گفتن نیست
در بی سری عشق چه سر میکنی مکن

'Draw in thy head, O comrade, for this is not the season of speech;
'In the headlessness of Love why raisest thou thy head? Do it not.'

And Háfiz: —

عجب راهیست راه عشق کآنجا * کسی سر بر کند کش سر نباشد

'A wondrous path is the Path of Love, for there
'He who upliſteth his head is he who is headless.'

During those wild years when the Princes of the Decarchy were carving their little kingdoms out of the shattered empire of the Seljúq there lived in Anatolia a holy man, Yúnus Imre by name, who, though said to have been quite unlearned and scarce able to read, appears to be the first recorded native poet of the Western Turks.

ᶜAshiq Chelebi, whose Tezkire or Dictionary of the Poets is one of the most interesting and valuable works of its class, alone among the biographers of poets mentions Yúnus; but Tash-köpri-záde, the author of the Crimson Peony, has a few remarks concerning him which reappear among the notices of contemporary learned and pious men that the historians Saᶜd-ud-Dín [1] and ᶜAlí subjoin to their accounts of the several Sultans' reigns. All we learn from these sources is that Yúnus was a native of the district of Boli in what is now the viláyet or province of Qastamuni, but at the close of the thirteenth century formed part of the petty kingdom of Qizil-Ahmedli, and that he was a disciple of a teacher called Tapduq Imre. In the Crimson Peony and in ᶜAlí's History we read that for long he acted — after the ancient fashion of the East — as servant to his master, and that never once among the faggots which he used to gather and bring to the hermit's cell was there a crooked stick,

[1] Saᶜd-ud-Dín Efendi was born in Constantinople in 943 (1536-7) and died there in 1008 (1599-1600). His history of the first nine Ottoman Sultans, called Táj-ut-Tewáríkh or 'The Crown of Chronicles,' is very famous and is reckoned an admirable example of the Turkish prose of its period. It is popularly called Khoja Táríkhi or 'The Khoja's History,' the author having been khoja or preceptor to Sultan Murád III.

which circumstance, ᶜAlí adds, attracted the attention of his teacher who one day said to him, 'Is there never a crooked stick on the hills where thou cuttest wood?' whereupon the disciple replied, 'Things crooked profit not in either world that I should bring such to your threshold,' an answer which, we are told, called down on him the master's blessing. These are the only biographical items recorded concerning Yúnus; but Tash-köpri-záde and his two followers devote each a brief notice to his teacher Tapduq Imre. From these we learn that this saintly personage settled in a hamlet near the river Saqariya where he lived in seclusion, though, following the 'noble custom of the holy,' he imparted instruction to a band of disciples. [1]

None of these biographers gives any date in connection with either master or pupil; but Tash-köpri-záde, and therefore Saᶜd-ud-Dín and ᶜAlí, — though without mentioning any authority for so doing — place them among the sheykhs of Sultan Yildirim Báyezíd's time (A. H. 792—805. A. D. 1390—1403). But as Veled Chelebi points out in the article already quoted, there occurs in one of Yúnus's own poems the following passage which shows him to have flourished nearly a century earlier: —

'And seven hundred and seven was the date
'When Yúnus laid down his life (i. e. devoted himself) in this Path.' [2]

The Muhammedan year 707 begins on the 3rd. of July 1307 and ends on the 20th. of June 1308.

For the rest, the biographers merely say that Yúnus was unlettered, that his talent was the direct gift of God. Thus

[1] ᶜAlí adds that Tapduq Imre was a friend of the celebrated saint Hajji Bektash; but many of his stories concerning these holy men of old are so obviously legendary that little reliance can be placed on his statement.

[2] تاریخ دخی یدی یوز یدی ایدی
یونس جانی بو یولده قودی ایدی

ʿAshiq writes that Yúnus was 'of the number of those perfect ones who are pulled by the hook of the Divine Attraction from the World of the Kingdom to the World of the Angelry,' [1] and that 'for all he was illiterate, he was of them who read in the college of the Divine, of them who turn the pages of the book: "We have been given knowledge for an inheritance from the Living who dieth not!" [2]' that he was 'of the saintly and just who translate the language of the lip into the language of the heart, and of those Companions of the Secret who with the Voice of the Unseen World [3] declare what is in the soul.' The biographer adds that Yúnus could hardly read, that, as he puts it in his figurative way, 'the mirror of his heart was undulled by the turbidity of the lines and curves.' [4]

Referring to his work, the Crimson Peony says, 'from the words he uttered in the ballad [5] style in the Turkish tongue containing subtle points and allusions and excellencies, it is clear and manifest that he had a perfect knowledge of the Divine mysteries and held an exalted station in the Perception of the Unity.' [6] ʿAlí has nothing about illiteracy, but

[1] i. e. from the physical to the spiritual plane, see pp. 55-6.

[2] نَحْنُ أُورِثْنَا ٱلْعِلْمَ مِنَ ٱلْحَيِّ ٱلَّذِى لَا يَمُوتُ

[3] Lisán-ul-Ghayb, lit. 'the Tongue of the Unseen World,' such as that wherewith spoke the prophets and saints when under inspiration. Háfiz is sometimes called 'the Voice from the Unseen,' because it was usual to draw auguries by opening his Díwán at hazard and judging from the first passage that caught the eye. This species of divination was once common in Europe, where the Bible and the works of Virgil were generally used.

[4] The 'lines and curves,' i. e. the letters of the alphabet.

[5] The original word is Warsaghi, which is the name of a kind of ballad (presumably) invented by, or learned from, the Warsaqs, a nomadic Turkish tribe scattered in the Qaraman district. The word is however used also by the Eastern Turks.

[6] ʿIlm-i Tevhíd 'the Knowledge or Perception of the Unity,' i. e. that aspect of mysticism which discloses to the saint the ultimate Oneness of all existing things.

says that Yúnus made in the Turkish language endless pleasant verses hinting at the mysteries.

The poetry of Yúnus Imre, as we have it in the lithographed edition of his works, [1] consists of something over six hundred couplets in mesneví verse and a díwán of between three and four hundred ghazels. All this verse is written in the Turkish metres, which is doubtless what Tash-köprizáde means when he speaks of Yúnus's words being in the 'ballad style.' In most of the ghazels there is present, in greater or less measure, the favourite Turkish arrangement of a thrice-repeated internal sub-rhyme, an arrangement which, as has been said before, works out into practical identity with what in more literary poetry is known as musemmat verse. [2]

Although the poems as they appear in the lithographed Díwán can hardly be in every respect quite what they were in their original form, such changes as they may have suffered during the centuries would not appear to be very vital. The rudeness inevitably attaching to a first endeavour and the ultra-Turkish character which distinguishes them are evident in every line. The rhymes, both final and internal, are often extremely defective, frequently merely assonant, it being sometimes only the vowel-sounds that agree, sometimes only the final consonants. There is of course no conscious attempt at any artificial graces; the Art of Rhetoric did not exist for Yúnus. The language, though naturally abounding in long-obsolete words and forms, is considerably more Ottoman than that of the Rebáb-Náme verses. This may probably be in some measure owing to the 'corrections' of successive copyists, but it is no doubt chiefly attributable to the fact that the author was a northern Turk.

[1] Lithographed in 1302 (1884-5).

[2] See p. 72.

In matter the poems are exclusively transcendental. Yúnus was a thorough-going mystic; nothing outside the Súfí philosophy seems to have had the slightest interest for him. There is no more single-minded poet in all Turkish literature. But while he touches more or less on nearly every side of the system, what appears to have impressed him most profoundly is the stupendous conception of the ultimate Unity of all things. Thus he loves to tell how he was with the Beloved in the beginning, how he was Moses beholding the Divine Epiphany on Mount Sinai, how he was Abraham and likewise the ram he sacrificed in his son's stead, how he was Joseph and likewise the one who purchased him,[1] how he was Mansúr and likewise his executioners;[2] he further identifies himself with brutes and even inanimate objects, declaring that he is the snake in its dust-hole, the cloud wandering over the sky, the rain that descends upon the earth; and in more than one place he openly proclaims that he is God 'who createth man from seed and who bringeth the bird from the egg.' Yúnus's pantheism is thus frank and outspoken; it does not, like that of so many later poets, conceal itself behind a veil of allegory. This old singer says what he means in the most downright fashion.

Yúnus's verse is rugged beyond that of any other Turkish poet; this is in part owing to the fact that he alone used exclusively the uncultivated Turkish metres; Sultán Veled, as we have already seen, and Yúnus's contemporaries and immediate successors, as we shall shortly see, although they did not systematically adopt the Persian quantitative scansion, wrote in one of the established Persian metres, and thus a certain air of culture is at once given to their work.

Though the direction be unusual, we clearly see in the work

[1] That is Zelíkhá, Potiphar's wife, of whom we shall hear much.

[2] For Mansúr, see p. 21, n. 2.

of this poet the influence of the master spirit of the age, Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín. For unlike most of the early Turkish poets, Yúnus is a lyric writer, and so he finds his inspiration less in the Mesneví than in the Díwán of the great mystic. The points of contact between master and disciple are many. All the philosophy of Yúnus will be found in the Díwán of Jelál, notably the former's favourite doctrine of the ultimate Unity, which appears there in quite the manner in which he afterwards proclaimed it.[1] There is also some resemblance in outward form; Yúnus is hardly more partial to the internal sub-rhyme than is Jelál himself; but imitation is less likely here, as this arrangement is at least as much Turkish as it is Persian.

Yet Yúnus had practically no model; though inspired by Jelál, he did not, like the early mesneví-writers, copy the Persian masters, and there was no lyric poetry in Western Turkish. There was nothing but some rude folk-songs and popular ballads; and it was in the way of these that Yúnus fashioned his verse. He may indeed have seen or heard the Díwán-i Hikmet of Khoja Ahmed-i Yeseví, which has much in common with his own both in manner and matter; but this is in Eastern, not Western, Turkish.

We have seen that the biographers say that Yúnus could barely read, we have also seen that these same biographers knew very little about Yúnus. The mere fact that his verses are in the native and not the Persian metres is itself enough to stamp him a barbarian in the eyes of these literary mandarins; it was enough to make Latífí and Hasan Chelebi exclude him altogether from their Memoirs. Of course it is impossible to decide whether the statement of ʿÁshiq and the others is correct, but there is abundant evidence in the Díwán to show that Yúnus was not only perfectly familiar

[1] See the ghazel printed on pp. 331-2 of Mr. Nicholson's Selections from the Dīwāni Shamsi Tabrīz.

with the philosophy of Jelál-ud-Dín, but was thoroughly acquainted with the theological lore of his time. All that we can say is that his verse, remarkable in any case, is doubly wonderful if it be the work of a man so illiterate.

Here are two of Yúnus's pantheistic ghazels.

Ghazel. [6]

Faith, idol, Kaʿba-fane [1] am I; who smites the sphere a-spin [2] am I;
The cloud upon the heavens' face, likewise the rains that rain am I.

The thunderbolt that flasheth forth, that, flashing, weaves itself in birth;
The poison-snake that deep in earth to creep and cower is fain am I.

The one who Hamza [3] drew o'er Qáf, [4] who swelled his hands and feet therewith;
Who many from their thrones drave off, the King of Wisdom's Rayne am I.

The cloud that doth to heaven ascend, the rain that doth to earth descend,
The haze and mist that doth before the sightless eyes remain am I.

Who buildeth bone and flesh and skin, who keepeth this a living thing,
Who lieth Wisdom's crib within and Power's milk doth drain am I.

Who summer brings and earth doth cheer, who makes our heart-house His repair; [5]
Who doth consent to dam and sire, [6] who knoweth Serfhood's gain am I.

[1] The Kaʿba or 'Cubical House' at Mekka is the centre of the Muhammedan world. Towards it the Faithful turn when they worship, and to visit it they go on pilgrimage from every land. Here Yúnus takes it to typify Islam, the 'idol' standing for the (conventionally) false religions; he would identify himself with every form of religion, non-Muhammedan as well as Muhammedan.

[2] i. e. He who makes the spheres revolve.

[3] This line refers to an incident in the legendary history of Hamza the uncle of the Prophet.

[4] For the mountain-chains of Qáf see p. 38.

[5] Probably an allusion to the well-known Hadís قَلْبُ ٱلْمُؤْمِنِ بَيْتُ ٱللّٰهِ 'the heart of the believer is the house of God.'

[6] i. e. He who while thus universal condescends to individual, physical birth.

Full many an one have I made thrall, I've lived a merry life withal;
What coalless burns,[1] what leaps when hammer-blows on iron rain[2] am I.

Let him come here who suffers woe that I to him a place may show;
My heart his home, mine eye his town; Time in the Cycle-train[3] am I.

It is not Yúnus sayeth this, 'tis Power's Tongue that speaketh thus;
Who credits not a paynim is, the First and Latest e'en am I.

Ghazel. [7]

That Mighty One of 'Be! and 'tis,'[4] that Lord of gracious sway am I.
That King who ere 'tis cut provides for each his bread each day am I.[5]

The One who maketh man of seed, who maketh bird from egg proceed,
Who makes the Tongue of Power to speak, He who remembereth aye am I.[6]

Who maketh some ascetics be, and some to work iniquity;
That Argument and Proof who veils their faults and flaws alway am I.

Who unto one doth horses give, doth wives and wealth and children give,
The while another lacks a groat, — that One of gracious sway am I.

[1] In allusion to this famous passage of the Koran, xxiv, 35: 'God is the light of the heavens and the earth; His light is as a niche in which is a lamp, and the lamp is in a glass, the glass is as though it were a glittering star; it is lit from a blessed tree, an olive neither of the east nor of the west, the oil of which would well-nigh give light though no fire touched it, — light upon light! — God guideth to His light whom He pleaseth, and God striketh out parables for men, and God all things doth know.'

[2] i. e. Fire (Nár), this is contrasted with 'what coalless burns,' i. e. Light (Núr). Light (Núr) and Fire (Nár) are often taken to symbolise respectively the Beautiful (Jemál) and the Awful (Jelál) Attributes of God. See p. 66, n. 2.

[3] The circling Time that brings healing on its wings.

[4] In the Koran, ii, 111, we read, 'And when He decreeth a matter, He doth but say unto it 'Be!' and it is.' This phrase, 'Be! and it is,' expressing the Divine command and its instantaneous effect, summarises the creative power of God, and is repeated again and again in the Koran. It finds a parallel in the Biblical text, 'He spake; and it was *done*.' (Psalms, xxxiii, 9.) where 'done' is printed in italics, as not being in the original Hebrew.

[5] He who while the grain is yet growing assigns to each creature its daily portion.

[6] An allusion to Koran, ii, 147, where God says, 'Remember me, and I will remember you; thank me, and be not ungrateful.'

Who bringeth snow and doth earth freeze, who on each brute his food bestows,
Who worketh all these businesses, the Soul of souls in fay am I.

I am Eternity in sooth, that King, the Unconditioned Truth;
To-morrow Khizr[1] may water dole, who wipes his sins away am I.

Know ye what from Four Things proceed, behold, I am the Sign indeed;
That God who builded Fire and Air and Earth and Water, yea, am I.

Who holds the veils of flesh and skin and bone and life and body e'en;
My works are Power and many an one, the Hid and Open aye am I.

The Outer and the Inner I, the Former and the Latter I;
Yea, I am He, and He is I, He whom they praise alway am I.

No truchman may between Us be, all wroughten there is clear to me;
Who giveth me this tongue is He; yon Sea that rolls each way am I.

He who did earth and sky create, who maketh Throne and Stool rotate;[2]
Thousand and one His Names;[3] Yúnus, He of the Koran,[4] yea, am I.

[1] This Khizr is a very vague personage, but one whom we are continually encountering in Oriental poetry. He is mentioned in the Koran, and is believed to have been one of the ancient Prophets, being confused by some with Elias and St. George, both of whom are called Khizr-Ilyás. It is generally in connection with the Stream of Life, of which he is often represented as the guardian, that he is mentioned by the poets. Having drunk of that Living Water, he is, of course, immortal, and it is said that sometimes, under the form of an aged man, he appears to pious Muslims in distress and helps them out of their troubles, but disappears as soon as his identity is suspected. In the Alexander-legend Khizr, as we shall see by and by, is represented as an officer in the army which accompanies the great conqueror on his quest of the Fountain of Life, and is the only man in all the host to find and drink of the wondrous Stream. The name Khizr is Arabic, and is etymologically connected with the idea of greenness, the connection perhaps being through evergreen to immortal.

Yúnus in the present passage means to say that to him the Water of Life which Khizr might offer is as nothing, that indeed it is he (Yúnus) who forgives that holy one (Khizr) his sins.

[2] 'Throne and Stool,' in the original, ʿArsh and Kursí (see p. 35); as these are spoken of as rotating, the poet may possibly mean them to be taken here as the Ninth and Eighth Spheres (see p. 68).

[3] It is said by some that the 'Names' of God are one thousand and one.

[4] 'He of the Koran,' i. e. the Author of the Koran, i. e. God.

The next ghazel seems to be an invitation to some friend to follow the mystic life.

Ghazel. [8]

Come and let us two be comrades, come and let us seek the Loved One;[1]
Come and let us two be helpmates, come and let us seek the Loved One.

Come and guide me on our faring; to the Friend[2] be our repairing;
Cast aside all dule and caring, come and let us seek the Loved One.

Let us quit the world together, cheated not, for it doth wither;
Let us two be parted never, come and let us seek the Loved One.

Soothly is the world unstable; ope thine eye, thy soul is sleeping;
Unto us be fere and comrade, come and let us seek the Loved One.

Ere the clutch of Fate impel us, ere the voice of Death do hail us,
Ere that ʿAzrá'íl[3] assail us, come and let us seek the Loved One.

Let us see the loyal lover[4] tidings of The Truth to gather,
Let us find the lover Yúnus, come and let us seek the Loved One.

In the following passage in mesneví verse Yúnus boldly attacks certain points in the conception of God prevalent among the more ignorant or fanatical of the orthodox.

Mesneví. [9]

O my God, if so be Thou should question me,
Lo then, this would be mine answer unto Thee: —
'Gainst myself I've sinned and mine own hurt have sought;
But to Thee, O King, what have I done or wrought?
Ere I came Thou didst decree me frail to be;[5]

[1] 'The Loved One,' i. e. God.
[2] 'The Friend,' i. e. God.
[3] ʿAzrá'íl is the name of the Angel of Death.
[4] The 'lover' is of course the mystic.
[5] Even as we read in the Koran, iv, 32, 'For man was created weak.'

Ere my birth Thou saidst: 'A rebel he 'gainst me!'
Even as Thou wouldest, so with me Thou'st done;
Whatsoe'er I've wrought, 'tis Thou hast wrought alone.
When I oped mine eyes a prison met my view,
Crammed with fiends and devils, and with lust a-stew. [1]
Saying, 'Lest within this jail I hungered die,'
Times have been when clean [2] and unclean eat have I.
Was it I who schemed me? — nay, Thou didst me scheme;
Why createdst me so faultful, Lord Supreme?
Was there aught a-lacking to Thy Sovranty?
Or had word of mine a part in Thy decree?
Did I leave Thee hungry, eating up Thy dole?
Or did I on sudden make Thee want to thole?
Thou dost make a Bridge like to a hair [3] and say:
'Cross, and save thee from thy doom decreed, straightway!'
How should man cross o'er a bridge like to a hair?
Or he slippeth or he falleth headlong there.
When Thy servants build a bridge it is for good;
This the good, that folk may safely cross the flood.
So 'tis needful it be strong and spacious too,
That the crossers say: 'Lo, here the roadway true!'
Thou hast set a Balance [4] evil deeds to weigh;

[1] The devil-crammed prison may perhaps be the world, perhaps the human heart.

[2] 'Musmul' the word in the original, is a corruption of 'bismil' which is applied to the flesh of animals slaughtered for food according to the requirements of the Law. In this line the poet confesses that he has at times transgressed the Law, but insinuates that he has done so under the compulsion of circumstances beyond his control.

[3] This refers to the Bridge Sirát 'finer than a hair and sharper than a sword' which according to common belief — though there is no mention of it in the Koran — spans the gulf of hell, and over which, it is said, all must pass after the Last Judgment, the wicked to fall into the abyss. This fable, the allegorical origin of which is obvious, is common to the Jewish and Magian traditions, whence doubtless it found its way into popular Islam.

[4] This again alludes to the allegorical Balance (also taken literally by the vulgar) in which God will on the Judgment Day weigh the good and evil deeds of men. It is referred to in several passages of the Koran, such as the following (vii, 7-8): 'And the balance on that Day is Truth; and whosesoever scales are heavy, they are the prosperous; and whosesoever scales are light,

Hast designed to cast me in the fire straightway.
Scales are meet for him who may a grocer be,
May a goldsmith, merchantman, or spicer be.
Thou'rt omniscient, so Thou know'st mine every way;
Where Thy need then all my actions thus to weigh?
Since that sin uncleanest is of things unclean,
In itself the very work of evil men,
Why shouldst Thou search out and weigh that filthiness?
This were seemly, that Thou veil it with Thy grace.
Thus Thou sayest: 'Mid the fire I will thee fling
'If I see that heavy comes thine ill-doing.'
In Thy hand is ill's decrease and weal's increase,
In Thy hand is weal's decrease and ill's increase.
Look Thou on then at Thine ease and I shall burn!
(Far be this from Thee, O Lord for whom men yearn!) [1]
Is Thy vengeance sated? — Thou hast made me die,
Turned me into dust, with earth hast stopped my eye!
For a handful dust [2] is all this much ado
Needful, O Thou gracious Lord of Glory true?
Now from Yúnus there hath sprung no evil deed;
And Thou knowest all that is, revealed and hid.

they are those who lose themselves.' Here, as when speaking of the Bridge, the poet satirizes the idea of God punishing man whom He created so frail.

[1] By this line the poet would show that it is not the way of God (whom he loves) that he is assailing, but only a false and degrading conception thereof.

[2] i. e. a mortal man.

Another very early mystic poet is a certain ᶜAlí, who is, however, always spoken of as ᶜAshiq Pasha, the name ᶜAshiq, which signifies 'Lover,' being a surname given to or assumed by him on account of his mystic fervour, while the title Pasha is in his case a mere honorific. In a preface in Persian prose prefixed to many manuscripts of his work, this poet tells us something of his own genealogy; he there describes himself as ᶜAlí, the son of el-Mukhlis, the son of Sheykh Ilyás; he whose grandfather was commonly known as Baba (i. e. Father), and who himself is commonly known as Sheykh Pasha el-ᶜAshiq.

This grandfather, Baba Ilyás as he is generally called, receives a brief notice in Tash-köpri-záde's Crimson Peony, where it is stated that he dwelt in Amasiya and that, as he was a worker of miracles, he had a large number of disciples; but that the Seljúq Sultan Ghiyás-ud-Dín the son of ᶜAlá-ud-Dín,[1] fearing a dervish revolt, ordered a general massacre of the Súfís, and that Baba Ilyás soon after this fell into the hands of the Sultan's troops, and was killed and his succession cut off. In a marginal note to the printed edition of the Peony, Baba Ilyás is further described as el-Khurásání (i. e. the Khurásán man), and it is added that on the irruption of Jengíz[2] he came (presumably from Khurásán)

[1] The Seljúq Sultan, Ghiyás-ud-Dín II, succeeded to the throne in 634 (1236-7). The Mongols under Hulagu invaded Western Asia in 641 (1243). Ghiyás was defeated and surrendered in 643 (1245-6), whereupon he was deposed from the Sultanate. He was put to death in 657 (1259). Ghiyás-ud-Dín II was the last Seljúq Sultan to wield any real power.

[2] Jengíz began his career of foreign conquest early in the thirteenth century; it continued unchecked until his death in 624 (1227).

into Rúm, and there settled in the neighbourhood of Amasiya.

The story of Baba Ilyás as given by Von Hammer [1] differs considerably from the account in the Crimson Peony. The Austrian historian tells us that the first trouble of the reign of Sultan Ghiyás-ud-Dín II was caused by a revolt of dervishes excited by this Ilyás who had played upon the fanaticism of the people. The revolt was suppressed; but its instigator managed so to ingratiate himself with Ghiyás-ud-Dín that Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín and his companions left the Seljúq court in disgust. In another place [2] the same writer says, on the authority of the historian Jenábí, [3] that Baba Ilyás was killed in an attempt to raise the people of Amasiya. [4]

Concerning Sheykh Mukhlis, the son of this man, and the father of the poet, we are told by ʿAlí that on the death (probably it should be the deposition) of Sultan Ghiyás-ud-Dín, when chaos reigned in those regions, he was besought by the people of the province of Ionia, [5] and especially by his own disciples (for like his father he was ostensibly a mystic teacher), to become the ruler of the country. He consented, but after six months of sovereignty resigned, whereupon his province was handed over to Qaraman, the son of Núr-ud-Dín, which latter had been one of Baba Ilyás's

[1] Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, vol. i, pp. 43-4.

[2] Hist. Emp. Ott. vol. i, p. 262, note.

[3] Jenábí is an Ottoman historian who wrote in Arabic a history of the Muhammedan dynasties down to 997 (1588-9), under the title of El-Bahr-uz-Zakhkhár, 'The Flowing Tide.' He died in 999 (1590-1).

[4] Under the entry 'Qaraman' in his Biographical and Geographical Dictionary Sámí Bey speaks of Baba Ilyás as 'one of those sheykhs who took up dervishhood as a pretext for acquiring position and fortune,' and adds that he was killed. The story of his winning the Sultan's favour may perhaps arise from a confusion between him and his disciple Núr-ud-Dín the Súfí. From all accounts Baba Ilyás seems to have been one of those 'Súfís' whose acts contributed to bring the name of the sect into ill repute.

[5] The name Ionia (Yúnán) used sometimes to be given by the Turks to the region (more or less) which is generally called Qaraman.

'Súfís.'[1] Both ᶜAlí and Tash-köpri-záde say that Mukhlis, after staying for a time in the country subject to Qaraman, joined ᶜOsmán Khan, the founder of the Ottoman power, and was present at many of that monarch's victories.

Of the poet himself there is even less to tell than of his father or grandfather. Tash-köpri-záde and ᶜAlí both give him a brief notice, but Latífí is the only one of the Tezkire-writers to make any mention of him. The last-named biographer's statement that ᶜAshiq came from some place near the confines of Persia is almost certainly erroneous, and looks very like a blurred reminiscence of his grandfather's connection with Khurásán. Tash-köpri-záde is much more likely to be correct when he says that it was from the Kingdom of Qaraman that ᶜAshiq came to the town of Qir-Shehri, in what is now the province of Angora, where, according to all authorities he settled, and where he eventually died and was buried. Latífí says that it was during the time of Sultan Orkhan, who reigned from 726 (1326) to 761 (1359), that ᶜAshiq came into Rúm, being attracted thither by the

[1] According to Von Hammer (Hist. Emp. Ott. vol. i, p. 262), during the reign of Ghiyás-ud-Dín's predecessor ᶜAlá-ud-Dín, which extended from 616 (1219) to 634 (1236-7), 'Nour Sofi,' an Armenian by birth and one of the most fanatical disciples of Baba Ilyás, settled in Qonya, where his son Qaraman won the favour of the Sultan who gave him his daughter in marriage and appointed him to a high office at court. 'Nour Sofi' succeeded by a ruse in getting possession of the stronghold of Selefke — till then in Byzantine hands — whereupon ᶜAlá-ud-Dín invested Qaraman with the government of the same, adding thereto that of the town of Larende. This was the beginning of what on the Seljúq collapse became the Kingdom of Qaraman, originally the strongest in the Decarchy and for a century and a half the stoutest rival of the Ottoman. Tash-köpri-záde says that after Sheykh Mukhlis Baba had been King in Ionia (Yúnán) for six months he seated in his place Qaraman, a five-year-old son of Núr-ud-Dín, one of Baba Ilyás's Súfís.

As will be noticed, the historians differ as to the age of Qaraman; Von Hammer makes him a married man and court official during ᶜAlá-ud-Dín's reign; Tash-köpri-záde says he was a child at the time of the fall of Ghiyás-ud-Dín, ᶜAlá-ud-Dín's successor. Possibly the Qaraman who succeeded Sheykh Mukhlis was a grandson of Núr-ud-Dín the Súfí.

presence of the famous and venerated saint Hajji Bektash who was then living in the neighbourhood of Qir-Shehri and whose companion he became. [1]

That is all the biographers have to say concerning the life of this old poet, which would seem to have been as uneventful as any man's could be in those stirring times. Not one of them gives a single date; but in a Persian couplet [2] at the end of the table of chapters in his poem the dates of his birth and death are mentioned as 670 (1271-2) and 13th. Safer 733 (3rd. Nov. 1332). [3]

[1] This Hajji Bektash has always been a saint of great repute in Turkey. Early in the eighth century of the Hijre (the fourteenth century A. D.) he came from Níshápúr in Khurásán to Anatolia, where he was visited by Sultan Orkhan who received his blessing. When that Sultan founded the famous regiment of the Janissaries, he went to the cell of the saint accompanied by a few representatives of the newly instituted corps on which he implored the blessing of the holy man. Hajji Bektash in response held out his arm over the head of the foremost soldier, pronounced his blessing, and at the same time named the regiment Yeñi-Cheri or 'New-Troop,' which name we have corrupted into Janissary. Hajji Bektash lived on into the time of Sultan Murád I, who reigned from 761 (1359) to 792 (1390). He is buried at a place near Qir-Shehri called after him Hajji Bektash, and his tomb has ever been a favourite place of visitation. Numerous stories, many of which are recorded in ʿAlí's work, are current concerning the miracles he is alleged to have worked. The dervishes of the Bektashí order, which takes its name from him, have always regarded him as their Pír or spiritual chief; the rules of the order were not, however, drawn up by him, but by one of his disciples, Balim by name, who is looked upon as the second Pír of the order.

2. آمد اندر خع بعالم باز شد اندر ذلج
سیزده روز از صفر شب سه شنبه ای فلان

'He came to the world in khᶜ, he went away in zlj,
'The 13th. day of Safer, the night of Tuesday, O so-and-so!'

Here the numerical values of the letters خع khᶜ give 670, those of ذلج zlj give 733. 'So-and-so' is the reader.

[3] Kátib Chelebi likewise gives 733 as the year of ʿAshiq's death both in his Taqwímu-t-Tewáríkh or 'Chronological Tables' and in his great bibliographical dictionary called Keshf-uz-Zunún. Von Hammer's statement, for which he gives no authority, that the poet lived on into the reign of Murád I is therefore incorrect.

ᶜAshiq had a son named ᶜUlwán who was like himself a mystic poet, and who settled in a spot near Amasiya where his tomb is still a place of visitation. [1]

The biographers are at one in extolling the sanctity and many virtues of ᶜAshiq Pasha and in declaring that his tomb was in their time, as it still is, a favourite shrine with pious souls in the neighbourhood when they would in an especial manner supplicate the Heavenly Grace. [2] According to Latífí, he was man of great wealth and lived in princely style, but was none the less a true dervish in his heart and ways. 'He

[1] The only verse of ᶜUlwán Chelebi's that I have seen is the following which is quoted in the Crimson Peony: —

اولیانك قولیرینك اك كمی علوان درر * كمتریدر كمتریدر كمتریدر كمتریدر كمتری

'Still is ᶜUlwán the most lowly of the servants of the saints;
'He is lowliest, he is lowliest, lowliest of the lowly he.'

The author of the Peony says that in his youth he visited the tomb of ᶜUlwán and was much edified and benefited in consequence thereof. He says that ᶜUlwán was the author of a Díwán.'

[2] Although not countenanced by the Koran, the practice of visiting the tombs of holy men is common in Muhammedan countries. The object of these pious visitations varies with the intellectual status of the pilgrim. The most ignorant members of the community, more especially women of the lower classes, go there in order to implore some temporal or material favour (very often a son), and sometimes these even address their prayers to the saint himself. Persons somewhat higher in the intellectual and social scale look upon such spots as holy ground and believe that prayers offered there have a peculiar efficacy. The better educated among the strictly orthodox visit such shrines out of respect for the holy man and in order to salute the place where his remains repose. The object with which the mystics, with whom must be included most of the poets as well as writers like Tash-köpri-záde, make such pilgrimage is that they may enjoy what they call muráqaba or 'spiritual communion' with the soul of the holy man. The pilgrim in this case fixes his heart or soul wholly on that of the saint, the result being that it experiences an ecstatic communion with this in the Spirit World, whereby it is greatly strengthened and rejoiced on its return to the earthly plane. It is not, we are expressly told, because the soul of the saint is supposed to linger about his tomb that the mystic goes thither for his muráqaba; but because it is easier for the mystic to banish all outside thoughts and fix his heart wholly and exclusively on that of the saint in a place which is hallowed by associations with the latter.

is the dervish,' Latífí reports ᶜÁshiq as having said, 'who renounceth the world, he is the beggar whom the world renounceth; for with them of the Truth true poverty is not the outward, it is the inward; and that which they call dervishhood dwelleth not in homespun and serge and tattered cloak, it dwelleth in the heart; the dervish who loveth the world, whatsoever be his poverty and indigence, is yet a wordling; while that rich man, whatsoever be his riches and worldly power, who yet in his heart loveth not those things, nor inclineth thereunto, neither seeketh after them, howsoever rich a lord he be, is yet in the eyes of them of the Way among the folk of renunciation and of those who are dead unto the world: brief, dervishhood is the plucking from the heart the love of 'the-all beside,'[1] and the freeing of the soul from the fetters of the world; elsewise, through cowl and frock and rosary and staff becometh no man a Súfí pure of heart; and if one hold not this path, never shall he find the way to come nigh unto The Truth.'

The long mesneví poem which constitutes ᶜÁshiq Pasha's contribution to literature has been known by more names than one; but, as Dr. Rieu has pointed out,[2] its true title is Gharíb-Náme[3] or 'The Book of the Stranger.'[4] That this

[1] The Sum of the Universe is frequently expressed as: Alláh (i. e. 'God') *plus* Má-sewá-lláh i. e. 'What is beside God.' This phrase 'What is beside God' thus represents the phenomenal or contingent universe. Contracted to Má-sewá 'the what is beside,' 'the all beside,' or 'the what is else,' 'the all else,' it is constantly used by poets and other writers, generally with a sense similar to that of our expression 'the world, the flesh and the devil,' namely, material or earthly objects that engross man to the exclusion of things Divine.

[2] In his admirable Catalogue of the Turkish MSS. in the British Museum, 1888.

[3] The Gharíb-Náme is unprinted. There are two MSS. in the British Museum, one perfect (Harl. 5511), and one imperfect (Add. 7932).

[4] This title might allude to the state of man as an exile in this world, far from his Heavenly home, or to the position of the writer as a stranger in the town of Qir-Shehri.

is so is proved by a passage in the poem itself. In the last division of the last chapter, almost at the very end of the book, in a discourse on the Koranic text 'And we have not sent any apostle save with the language of his people,'[1] occur these lines: —

None did to the Turkish tongue a glance accord,
None had ever to the Turks his heart outpoured.
Yet the Turks knew naught of yonder tongues,[2] I say,
Naught of all those stages vast, that narrow Way.[3]
Now there comes this Gharíb-Náme in their speech,
That this folk likewise the hidden lore may reach.[4]

This leaves no doubt as to what the poet himself called his book; and this, his own title, has very properly been generally adopted of late.[5] But in the Crimson Peony, which was written in the middle of the sixteenth century, we read that the 'true name' of ᶜAshiq's poem is Maᶜárif-Náme or 'The Book of the Sciences;' and this is the title under which Kátib Chelebi[6] has entered it in his Bibliographical Dictionary. When Tash-köpri-záde speaks here of its 'true name,' he means to oppose this to its popular name which

[1] Koran, xiv, 4.

[2] Arabic and Persian.

[3] The mystic life is often figuratively spoken of as a Way or a Journey with many Stages all of which are carefully mapped out and well known to the initiate.

[4] تورك دلينا كمسنا بقمازدى * تركلرا هركز كوكل اقمازدى
ترك دخى بلمازدى بو دللرى * انجه يولى اول اولو منزللرى
بو غريب نامه انن كلدى دله * كم بو دل اهلى دخى معنى بله

[5] Thus Veled Chelebi in the article already referred to speaks of ᶜAshiq's poem as the Gharíb-Náme.

[6] Kátib Chelebi and Hajji Khalífa are the surnames given to Mustafa bin-ᶜAbdulláh, a very distinguished Ottoman scholar and man of letters who flourished during the seventeenth century, dying about the year 1068 (1657-8). He left many valuable works on various branches of knowledge, the most important being the great bibliographical dictionary entitled Keshf-uz-Zunún. This work, which is in Arabic, was published along with a Latin translation

was the 'Díwán of ᶜAshiq Pasha,' [1] or even simply 'ᶜAshiq Pasha.' This title of 'Díwán of ᶜAshiq Pasha,' which seems to have been the only one known to Latífí and Von Hammer, is singularly inappropriate to a poem which is wholly in mesneví verse, and must have arisen either through ignorance or through a slovenly use of the word Díwán as a generic name for books of poetry without regard to the nature of their contents.

ᶜAshiq's theme is naturally the mystic philosophy, the only possible theme for a poet of that age in those lands; and it is in true Oriental fashion that he sets about his task. He does not attempt to present to his readers any systematic account of the tenets that he holds, but by discoursing on a vast variety of subjects, always from the one standpoint, that of the Súfí thinker, he seeks to place them in possession of an immense mass of details all correlated, if all in chaos. The more readily to accomplish this, he hit upon an ingenious and, as far as I know, original plan for the arrangement of his book. The Gharíb-Náme is divided into ten Bábs or 'Chapters,' each of which is subdivided into ten Dástáns or 'Legends.' Now in the ten Legends of the First Chapter the poet deals with subjects associated in some way with the number One; similarly, in those of the Second Chapter he deals with subjects associated with the number Two. In like manner the Legends of the Third Chapter deal with 'the Threes,' those of the Fourth with 'the Fours,' and so on right through. Thus, for example, the Seventh Legend of the Fifth Chapter treats of the Five Senses, the First of the Seventh of the Seven Planets, while the

by G. Fluegel in 1835-58. European writers generally speak of this author by his surname of Hajji Khalífa (which they usually corrupt into Hajji Khalfa); Turkish writers generally call him Kátib Chelebi. I prefer to follow the Turks.

[1] Sometimes in the Turkish form, ᶜAshiq Pasha Díwáni; sometimes in the Persian, Díwán-i ᶜAshiq Pasha.

Third of the same has for text the Seven Ages of Man. As a rule, each Legend consists of two parts, the first containing the exposition of the subject, and the second being a kind of metrical homily on some verse of the Koran or some Hadís or other aphorism of the mystics which, along with the subject, is indicated in a prefatory rubric.

That the poet is thus enabled in his hundred Legends to touch upon a great variety of matters is obvious; not less so is it that while his work may thereby acquire an external semblance of orderliness, an artificial and fantastic arrangement such as this must, even were there nothing else, render the expression of any true sequence of ideas an impossibility. When I speak of a true sequence of ideas I speak from the modern European point of view; but in considering such works as this Gharíb-Náme we must ever bear in mind that they were not written for modern Europeans, that they were written by Oriental mystics for Oriental mystics, that is, by and for men whose mental attitude is very different from ours. The purpose of such books, moreover, is not to expound the Súfí philosophic system — that is taken for known and granted — but to show by example piled upon example how the central truth upon which that system is built underlies all phenomena psychical and physical alike.

The Gharíb-Náme was finished in 730 (1329-30),[1] only three years before the poet's death, and although it is therefore probable that it was, at least in part, written in the town of Qir-Shehri, it were natural to imagine that the dialect in which it is composed would be that of the author's native country of Qaraman. But there is a marked difference between

[1] We learn this from the following lines that occur in the epilogue: —

بو کتابك ختم اوش اولدی تمام * طپطلو یوز داستان کلدی تمام
بیدیوز اوتوز یلنده هجرتك * سوز اردی ختمینه بو فکرتك

ʿAshiq's vocabulary and that of Sultán Veled whose work was written less than thirty years earlier and in Qonya, the very city that became the Qaraman capital. ʿAshiq Pasha's language, though differing in detail from that of Yúnus, resembles it in being much closer to the Ottoman than that of Veled. It may therefore be that the Gharíb-Náme was either written wholly in Qir-Shehri and in the dialect which prevailed there, or, that if any part were composed before the author's arrival in that town, this was modified after he had settled there and become familiar with the local form of Turkish. ʿAshiq's metre is the Persian hexametric remel, [1] that of Jelál-ud-Dín and Sultán Veled; his prosody continues essentially Turkish, but with a larger percentage of quantitative feet and a more sustained endeavour to manipulate the words in conformity with the Persian system.

The verses themselves read smoothly, and in matters of technique are on the whole tolerably correct; but poetry they are not. The work is a poem in form alone, and at a later period would most probably have been written in prose. As it is, the author naturally took Sultán Veled and Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín as his models; they wrote in verse, so he did the same; they used a particular metre, so he used it also; they, engrossed in the didactic side of their work, wholly overlooked the artistic, so he did likewise. ʿAshiq plods on through his hundred Legends patiently and conscientiously, but he rarely, if ever, gets beyond the level of a not very distinguished prose. His work has even less of the quality of poetry than Veled's; and were it not for the curious conceptions and quaint illustrations that are scattered through its chapters, it would prove but dreary reading. There is, of

[1] The Remel-i Museddes or 'Hexametric Remel' (see p. 108) is so called because each couplet consists of six feet, thus: —

– ∪ – – | – ∪ – – | – ∪ – || – ∪ – – | – ∪ – – | – ∪ –

course, hardly any attempt at art;[1] the rhymes are often imperfect, and there is — as is usual in literatures in their infancy — a constant recurrence of certain expletive phrases when lines have to be filled up. By way of accounting for this absence of the rhetorical embellishments so dear to the Oriental, Latífí tells us that the men of God give no heed to artifices and fancies in their verses in order to find favour with the people, nor seek to trick out their phrases in the hope of fame and honour. If we add to this the example of ʿAshiq's models and the condition of the Turkish language at the time he wrote, the explanation will be fairly adequate.

At the end of the Persian preface already mentioned occur the following four lines of Turkish verse — the first words in that language in the book — which read like an apology for the poem's being written in the vulgar tongue instead of in Arabic or Persian, which up till then had been regarded as the only literary languages of Islam: —

> Even though the Turkish tongue is spoken here,
> Yet the Mystic Stages are made known and clear.
> So thou findest all the Stages of the Way,
> Turn not thou from Turk or Tajik[2] tongue away.[3]

The reason why ʿAshiq chose to write in Turkish we have already learned from the passage quoted on page 182; and whatever we may think of his literary ability, we must hold him in honour as the first who seriously and system-

[1] The only rhetorical figure that recurs with any frequency is the variety of homonymy known as merfú or 'repaired' which is described on page 117, and, as there remarked, has always been a favourite with the Turkish poets.

[2] Tajik is a name given in some parts of Central Asia to the descendants of the Persians who remained in the cities of those regions after their occupation by the Turks.

[3] كرچه كم سُيْلَنِد بُنده ترك دلى * معلوم اولدى الا معنى منزلى
چون بُلاسن جمله يول منزللرن * يِرْمَكل سن ترك وتاجك دللرن

atically endeavoured to lay open before his fellow-countrymen what was for him the Way of Truth.

The following is the First Legend of the Fourth Chapter and is here translated in its entirety; the subject, namely the Four Elements of early science, as well as the aphorism and the Koranic verse which form the text of the homily, is mentioned in the Persian prose rubric which runs thus: — 'The First Legend of the Fourth Chapter: The Story of the Commentation on the Four Elements; the which are the Four Columns of the Microcosm and the Four Declensions of the Macrocosm,[1] the which consist of these: — the Fixture, the Traction, the Elevation and the Rest,[2] and the which are in the Similitude of Four Pillars: And on the Incitation to the Understanding of 'Whoso knoweth himself knoweth his Lord,'[3] and to the joyful Persistence in the Rendering of Thanks, because of this Verse, 'If ye give Thanks, I will surely give you Increase.'[4]

[1] For the Microcosm and Macrocosm see pp. 62-3.

[2] The terms Nasb, Jerr, Ref^{c}, Sukún, here rendered by 'Fixture,' 'Traction,' 'Elevation' and 'Rest,' are in Arabic grammar technically applied to the vowels, upon the position and interchange of which almost the whole mechanism of the language depends; these may thus be justly described as the 'Four Pillars' of the Arabic tongue. It is in like manner on the Four Elements and the interchanges that take place among these that the structure of the physical world rests (see pp. 47-8); wherefore these are often called the 'Four Columns.' Water may be compared to Nasb, 'Fixture,' because it is as it were tied down to Earth and is unable to rise to the higher spheres; Air to Jerr, 'Traction,' as the wind carries along things, such as ships at sea; Fire to Ref^{c}, 'Elevation,' as it is the lightest and most subtle of the elements, and ever seeks to ascend to its own, the highest of the elemental spheres (see p. 46); and Earth to Sukún, 'Rest,' as it is stationary in the centre of the Universe.

[3] This famous Súfiistic aphorism, which is attributed to ^{c}Alí, has been already mentioned (see p. 63).

[4] This is the verse from the Koran, xiv, 7.

From the Gharíb-Náme. [10]

The First Legend of the Fourth Chapter.

Lo! the wondrous things that God hath wroughten see!
What the hand of Power Divine hath brought to be!
Wishful yearnéd He to make Himself be known,[1]
Build the Kingdom,[2] fill with creatures of His own.
'Be!' He said,[3] — the world, the soul, the body were,
Earth and sky arose, and man and genie there.
Every thing another's cause ordainéd He,
Hence relationship 'twixt all the things that be.
Never hath there been a causeless thing on earth,
Never unrelated creature hath come forth.
Whatsoe'er hath come, there is a root for all;
Whatsoever thing hath root hath shoot withal.
He who hath nor root nor branch, — then who is he?
He is He who unto all doth give decree!
Listen, till that of His mighty power I tell,
So that thou may know this business sure and well;
See what He hath done, what He hath made, hath wrought,
What He hath created, what from what hath brought.
Knowledge of this work behoveth thee always,
List then while I tell, then plunge midmost amaze.
First the Prime Intelligence[4] created He,
Through the which Four Ministers He made to be;
He those Four the Columns Four of earth hath dressed,
Whereby Fixture, Elevation, Traction, Rest.
Water, Fire, Air and Earth He named them there,
And He made of them this Kingdom's bases fair.

[1] An allusion to the Hadís: 'I was a Hidden Treasure, therefore was I fain to be known, and so I created creation in order that I should be known.' See pp. 16-7.

[2] Probably in reference to the term ʿAlem-i Mulk, the 'World of the Kingdom,' which the mystics so often give to the physical plane. See p. 56.

[3] An allusion to the Koranic phrase 'Be! and it is.' See p. 171, n. 4.

[4] The Primal or Universal Intelligence, the first emanation from the One. See p. 42.

Four domains unto the Four did God decree,
For it was not meet that these should subject be.
Each of these attends his work steadfast and sure,
And it is through these this world doth still endure.
Hearken now what is the work of each of these,
See how gladsome in his work the worker is.
Plain and garden blossom by the toil of one;
Through his labour oil and honey plenteous run.
As the Kingdom's lamp another shineth bright,
Earth and sky are filléd with his radiant light.
One is carpet-spreader to earth's surface e'er,
Which he careful waters, besoms, cleanses fair.
Thereunto ordainéd, fast abideth one,
That created things may pass their term thereon.
In their fourfold work the Four are blithe and gay;
Each a-work at his own work, yet mates are they.
Never till the Day of Resurrection glows
From their offices shall any these depose.
'Tis these Chieftains Four who form earth's bases sure;
These it is who ever hold the earth secure;
'Tis through these the world doth fixed and steadfast show;
'Tis through these that plants upon the earth do grow.
Naught upon this earth may to existence win
But of these there still is present therewithin.
Whatsoe'er hath form doth grow from out these Four,
And from these all such receive their food moreo'er.
Come then, and with thought consider thine estate;
Learn and understand, so thou be wise, thy state.
See too in what manner God hath dealt by thee,
How He fashioned thee, for what He made thee be;
What the Grace that yon All-Wise to thee hath shown,
What the boon that yon All-Kind to thee hath done.
If thou knowest of His power, give thanks alway,
Call upon Him ceasing never night or day.

The saying of Him — exalted be He! —
'If ye give thanks, I will surely give you increase.' [1]

[1] The already quoted Koranic verse which serves as text for the homily that follows.

So thou givest thanks, He will His gifts increase;
List then till I tell thee what thy business is.

The saying of Him — exalted be He! —
'And as for the favour of thy Lord, discourse thereof.'

When that God existence upon thee bestowed,
Earth and Water, Air and Fire in worship bowed;
Ready to thy service these arose straightway,
Full surrender to thy greatness offered they.[2]
Each to set his face in service loyal was fain;
(Know that this is true, nor hold these words for vain.)
What the work of each of these is I will tell,
That thou mayest know the manner of this tale.
Look, within thy heart a-burning see the Fire![3]
What the heat within thee, if it be not Fire?
'Tis the Fire keeps the vitals warm in thee;
'Tis through it thy body still in health doth be.
Fire too the sun that riseth every day
And with brightness fills thy house as dark it lay.
Nursing, it matureth all that thou dost sow;
Fostering, it ripens whatsoe'er doth grow,
That thou mayest eat and offer thanks withal,
Day and night upon the name of God mayst call.

'If ye give thanks, I will surely give you increase.'

Likewise came the Air and became breath for thee,
That thereby this cage[4] might walk, might living be.
Should the breath depart and not return again,
Dies the body, if no breath of Air be ta'en.
Every hour a thousand times, O saintly one,[5]
God doth grant that Air to thee, a precious boon,

[1] Koran, xciii, 11.

[2] All the elements being inferior to man who is the crown and compendium of the entire creation.

[3] Referring to what the old physicians called the 'Kind, or Kindly, (i. e. Natural) Heat' (Haráret-i Gharízíye), that is, the heat of the thick blood of the heart, in which the life resides. It represents the normal high temperature of the body.

[4] 'This cage,' i. e. the body in which the soul is, as it were, imprisoned.

[5] 'O saintly one' is an address to the pious reader.

That for this likewise thou mayest thanks accord;
So with grateful breath acknowledge thou the Lord. [1]

'If ye give thanks, I will surely give you increase.'

See the Water, how within thy veins 'tis blood.
If thou drink it, straightway is thy thirst subdued.
Therewithal thy body lives in pleasant guise,
Using it to wash in, drink, ablutionise.
Skinker 'tis alike for wordling and for saint;
Aye, and for the Master's Face it yearns a-faint.
This likewise yon Glorious One hath granted free,
Making it a fountain from His grace to thee,
That thou mightest drink and offer thanks anew;
Meet it is that service-rite be paid as due.

'If ye give thanks, I will surely give you increase.'

See the Earth and what the Lord therewith hath done;
He hath made the same for thee a pleasant throne.
He hath made a stead for thee on Earth right well
That upon the same thou mayest constant dwell.
From this Earth too He a form hath given thee
Such that dazed and mazed thereat are all who see.
Meet it is then thou shouldst offer thanks and praise,
Meet thou shouldest thank Him for this grace always.

'If ye give thanks, I will surely give you increase.'

So that lawful be for thee this breath and love,
So that hour by hour thy fortune greater prove,
Since these Four, O Joy, [2] unto thee service do,

[1] Sa'dí says in the Preface to the Gulistán, 'Every breath when it goeth down prolongeth life, and when it cometh forth it rejoiceth the soul; so in every breath are two blessings, and for every blessing a separate thanksgiving is due.'

[2] Ey Safá, 'O Joy' or 'O Calm;' this again is an address to the 'gentle reader.' The old mystic poets are fond of thus apostrophizing their readers, who were doubtless almost always mystic philosophers like themselves. Thus addresses like Ey Hakím! or 'O Sage!' Ey Ján! or 'O Soul!' Ey Deli! or 'O mad one!' are of constant occurrence.

Be thou in the Love of God both leal and true.
These at once thy servants are, thy source, thy heart;
Ne'er let doubt thereof within thy bosom start.
Greater these than thou to outward seeing are,
Lesser these than thou in inward being are.
If one look unto the form, these nourish thee;
Know thou yet that they in truth thy servants be.
Come are these to nourish and sustain thy frame,
Come they are not for to make thee slave to them.
Every thing doth serve the soul with one accord,
While the soul itself is come to serve the Lord.
Pity if it should its servants' servant be,
To its own dependents paying service-fee.
To the wise these words enow the meaning show;
O my mad one,[1] from these words will meaning grow.
Nor would more of words avail the fool in aught;
Hearing, of their meaning he would gather naught.[2]
Whosoever shall have known himself in truth,[3] —
He, collected,[4] to himself is come in sooth.
Unto him the root of all the meaning 's known,
Therefore is he judge and subject both in one.[5]
To the lover 'tis Love's words the meaning show,
Never shall the loveless frere the meaning know.
O my God! of him to whom these words are clear
Quicken Thou the love, that with his soul he hear;
Never let him from Thy love depart or stray,
Losing ne'er in Either World the Narrow Way.

[1] Here again the mystic reader is addressed. As we have already seen, the mystics are fond of speaking of themselves as 'mad.'

[2] These two couplets reflect the Arabic proverb, اَلْعَاقِلُ تَكْفِيهِ اَلْاِشَارَةُ وَ اَلْغَافِلُ لَا تَنْفَعُهُ اَلْفُ عِبَارَةٍ 'a hint sufficeth for the wise, but a thousand speeches profit not the heedless.'

[3] Here the poet refers to the aphorism quoted in the rubric.

[4] i. e. he whose mind is collected, is calm, being possessed of knowledge.

[5] i. e. such an one, knowing the laws of nature, is able to judge of them, and to determine many things through them; while he, in common with all, is subject to them. Moreover, he has reached the point where he sees that the knower and the known, that subject and object, are one.

In the following extract from the Sixth Legend of the Fourth Chapter there is a curious comparison of humanity to a road lying between earth and Heaven along which souls must journey, the human body being figured as a four-gated city on this road, through which all must pass. The homily which succeeds (here omitted) deals with the means of distinguishing the true mystic from the hypocrite.

From the Gharíb-Náme. [11]

The Sixth Legend of the Fourth Chapter.

Now shall I a wondrous matter tell in verse,
And from point to point expound, comment, rehearse,
That this matter edify the soul in thee,
Food and nouriture eke for thy faith it be;
That thou mayest from this matter know thy state,
That these words may learn thee of thine own estate;
That the faithful from the hypocrite thou know,
What the life of each of these is here below.
Hearken then and how this thing is I shall tell,
So thou mayest know this business sure and well.
Through humanity a four-doored road doth go,
Where the folk of earth and Heav'n pass to and fro,
E'en as 'twere a two-doored caravanseray,
Like the months the caravan fares on alway. [1]
Earth and Heaven, each doth like a country lie,
Like the road between them lies humanity.
As a city on that road this form [2] doth show,
Through the which both wise and foolish come and go.
In the middle of that city is a throne,
And the Sovran on that throne is God alone.

[1] The caravan of human individuals; these never remain, but like the months of the year they are ever passing away, others coming on to take their place. A caravanseray is an inn or hostelry where caravans halt on their journey.

[2] The human body.

Soul His kingdom, Heart His treasure-house, and there
Mind His alnager, His measure Knowledge fair.
Stands this City of the Form in high esteem;
E'en although to thee so circumscribed it seem.[1]
In this city there are Portals Four in truth;
I shall name each by its name in all good sooth:
One of these is called the Eye, and one the Ear,
One the Tongue, and one the Hand, as thou dost hear.
Good and evil, all must pass through these in whole,
Be arraigned before the mind, pass through the soul.
Through the Hand some leave that enter through the Eye,
Through the Ear come some that through the Tongue do hie.
Thus the Ear gets words the which it gives the heart,
From the heart again these to the Tongue do start;
Wot ye well what comes through Eye through Hand doth go,
And what comes through Ear through Tongue departeth, know.
* * * * * * * * * * * *

The last extract which I shall give from the Gharíb-Náme is the Fourth Legend of the Seventh Chapter. It describes a series of Seven Things contained one within the other and each the other's life. In this case there is no homily.

From the Gharíb-Náme. [12]

The Fourth Legend of the Seventh Chapter.

If thou'rt mate, O heart, with one who knows the Path,
Or if thou thyself art one who vision hath,
Learn its lesson from each thing that thou dost see,
So thou mayest know the Source whence all things be.
If the eye learn of things seen their lessoning,
In the heart will knowledge surely sprout and spring;
Thence to it the Hidden Treasure[2] will be shown,

[1] Man is the Microcosm, the summary and epitome of all things, so his body (form) has its share in his lofty rank.

[2] Another allusion to the favourite Hadís.

And by it the manner of this world be known.
Understand thou that this world is manifold:
What then are its folds? Why is it fold on fold?
What is of each fold the state, the fashioning?
Knowledge verily it is to know this thing.
Hearken then unto these words that I recite,
That thou mayest know the Heavenly Sovran's might.
Know then that this world is sevenfold, I say;
Inner, outer, hidden each from each are they. [1]
One the other's life these Seven Folds are, see,
These as 'twere the veins, as 'twere the blood those be.
Deeper in than all there lies the Life of Lives,
That it is for which each being yearns and strives.
Bodies are these Seven Folds, the life is That;
Whoso knoweth, he may know all things but That.
To the proving of these words come now are we;
Look, the providence of yonder Sovran see.
See thou how this world is fashioned sevenfold,
All toward that King Divine their faces hold.
Each of these shall I describe in turn to thee;
Listen now to how from first to last they be.
One Fold is this Earth and Sky, like body this.
Hearken thou, a wondrous disposition 'tis.
Now these Seven Folds are each the life of each;
Yet material they, if to their root thou reach.
Every form whose inner part is empty, still
Needeth something else its vacuum to fill.
See upon the Earth these Buildings [2] high and low;
That these are the life o'-th' Earth, O father, [3] know.
Through these buildings 'tis the world 's alive, I say;
Else 'twere only as a lifeless form for aye.
All these towns and villages on Earth that are,
These it is that keep the Earth alive, be ware.

[1] i. e. the Seven Folds.

[2] The original word implies not only buildings but all the external signs of the cultivation and prosperity of a country.

[3] Another address to the reader. The word here rendered 'father' is Dede which literally means 'grandfather,' but is a style given to dervishes, especially to members of the Mevleví order.

Wheresoever these be waste and ruinéd,
Know thou this that yonder place is truly dead.
In whatever place there naught of Buildings be,
No one from that place shall aught of profit see.
Thus 'tis Buildings are the life of Earth alway,
Though that in themselves material are they.

Now unto the Buildings' life arrived are we;
Hearken then to what the life thereof may be.
Even as 'tis Buildings that make Earth to live,
'Tis Humanity that life to them doth give;
'Tis the Form of Man that is the life of these;
Hear this mystery, then plunge midmost amaze.
Every Building whereto Man doth not repair,
Know that thence will come no profit anywhere.
Know of every ruined and deserted stead,
That 'tis as a carcass whence the life is fled.
Whatsoever realm doth all unpeopled lie, —
Dead is yonder region, dead, in verity!
'Tis the Folk that maketh kingdoms firm and sure,
Making still their life and welfare to endure.
'Tis the Folk that are a kingdom's life, in fay;
If they go, the kingdom dies, it cannot stay.
Many are the lives on earth, but noblest see
Standeth Man; yea, Noblest of the Noble he.
First of all created things Man standeth forth,
So 'tis he who rules the kingdoms upon earth.
Yea, 'tis Man that keeps the life in kingdoms, yea;
If a kingdom manless be, it dies straightway.

Now to Man a Soul [1] and Body both belong;
'Tis his Soul that keeps his Body stark and strong.
Goes the Soul, the Body dies, it works no more;
Others take his wealth and all his worldly store.
Through the Soul it is the Form hath beauty fair;
Goes the Soul, desire no more remaineth there. [2]
Through the Soul the ear doth hear, the eye behold,

[1] The sense of the word here translated 'Soul' fluctuates between that and 'life.'

[2] i e. in the body.

Through the Soul the foot doth walk, the hand doth hold,
Through the Soul it is the tongue hath power of speech,
And from land to land 'mong folk its judgments reach.
'Tis the Soul that keeps the Form a living thing;
For if go the Soul, what from the Form will spring?
That is settled, come and at the Soul look now,
What it is that makes the Soul alive see thou.
Know then Knowledge [1] makes the Soul alive in sooth,
Life unto the Soul 's the Knowledge of the Truth.
Whatsoever Soul is Knowledgeless is dead;
See thou how that lower than all else its stead.
'Tis through Knowledge that the Souls such virtue gain;
Therefore doth this over Kings and Sultans reign.
Yonder Soul whose life is Knowledge of the Lord, —
See how over all it reigneth Sovran-lord.
'Tis this Heavenly Knowledge holds the Soul alive;
Much of wisdom from that Soul will grow and thrive.
In the dullard's Soul there is no life in sooth;
Know these words for true, for they are very truth.
Life upon the Knowers hath the Lord bestowed,
Therefore do these ever yearn and seek for God.
Since it is the life of Souls The Truth to know,
Faithfully this Heavenly Knowledge study thou.
Thus 'tis Knowledge doth the Soul alive maintain,
See now whence this Knowledge its own life doth gain.
'Tis through Reason [2] Knowledge lives in very deed;
Look through Reason, and therewith this Knowledge read.
Naught of Knowledge his who hath of Reason naught;
He who Reason hath is thence with Knowledge fraught.
He whose Knowledge lives hath this through Reason done,
He who Knowledge wins hath this through Reason won.
Yea, the Knowledge of the Reasonless is dead,
Hence no work of his hath aught accomplished.
'Tis this Reason is the life of Knowledge, sooth;
He who Reason lacks wins not through Knowledge truth.
Who hath Knowledge and yet doth not Reason own? —

[1] ʿIlm.
[2] ʿAql.

From a Knowledge such as his result were none.
Thus that Knowledge living is whose comrade true
Reason is from first to last and through and through.
Well, that Knowledge lives through Reason thou dost see;
Look now at what maketh Reason living be.
Look now, what is it that maketh Reason live?
Hearken, that the tale thereof to thee I give.
Love it is makes Reason live, know thou in truth;
Dead the Loveless Reason is in soothest sooth.
Who may man of Reason yet no Lover be?
Were there such, unworthy of The Truth were he.
Dead the Reason that for comrade hath not Love;
Lower such than e'en the very lusts thereof. [1]
For such Reason as with Love trod not the road
Wisdom and the Mysteries were never food.
'Tis this holy Love is Reason's life indeed;
Love it is that Reason up to God doth lead.
Whate'er Reason is not in that Presence dazed, —
Know the Love of God hath not its life upraised.
Rooted is such Reason fast in drearihead;
For no life it hath, which meaneth it is dead.
Lo this Reason's life is Love in very sooth;
See how Loveless Reason ne'er may win The Truth.
Well thou knowest now this Reason's life is Love;
Look at Love and see from whence its life doth prove,
See through what it is that Love is thus alive;
Know in truth The Truth to Love its life doth give.
Yea, the life of Love is through The Truth alone;

[1] The word here rendered 'lusts' is nefs, and possibly stands for Nefs-i Nebátíye 'the Soul Vegetable,' or Nefs-i Haywáníye 'the Soul Sensible,' — the vital and sentient principles in a living organism (see p. 48-50), Reason being here personified as such.

The word might also refer to the Nefs-i Emmáre, the first of the three states of the carnal mind. These three states are called: (1) the 'Commanding Flesh' (Nefs-i Emmáre) when the carnal mind is thoroughly dominant; (2) the 'Upbraiding Flesh' (Nefs-i Levwáme) when the carnal mind is resisted but still unsubmissive; (3) the 'Pacified Flesh' (Nefs-i Mutma'inne) when the carnal mind is totally subdued. The term Nefs-i Mutma'inne is sometimes applied to the pious mind of a saintly man obedient to all holy impulses, in which case it is better rendered as the 'Peaceful Spirit.'

Parted from The Truth, hath Love nor stead nor wone.
In the world below hath Love no fond desire,
To The Truth alone its wistful hopes aspire.
Naught in Love beside The Truth may ever be;
So the heart is filled, nor seeketh worldly fee.
Ne'er in Love do name and fame exultant rise;
But in Love full many a 'hidden treasure' lies.
'Tis The Truth's own word that by Love's tongue is said,
'Tis The Truth's own work that by Love's hand is sped;
'Tis The Truth's own light that looketh through Love's eye,
Therefore doth it build at times, at times destroy.
Reason, Spirit, Body, Soul are slaves to Love,
For The Truth hath filléd Love; doubt ne'er thereof.

Since it is The Truth makes Love alive in sooth,
Hold thou fast by Love that thou mayst win The Truth.
Love is His, the Lover and the Loved is He;
So thou wouldest win to Him, a Lover be.
Know that Love may never be from Him apart,
Ne'er for aught beside take then from Love thy heart.
Love is life of all, The Truth is life of Love;
Hid within the Signless doth that Signless move.

So these Seven Things whereof hath been our speech
Are in verity each one the life of each.
'Tis The Truth, O Joy, that makes the life of Love,
So the Man of Love can never faithless prove.
Love it is makes Reason live without gainsay,
So the face of Reason looks to Love alway.
Knowledge 'tis that holdeth Reason still alive,
From which cause it is this work doth grow and thrive.
Knowledge 'tis that makes the Soul alive, be ware;
Dead indeed the Soul that doth not Knowledge share.
Lives the Body through the Soul, Soulless 'tis dead;
'Neath the dust is aye the Soulless Body's stead.
'Tis through Bodies that yon Buildings living show;
How should kingdom flourish thus through jealous foe?
It is Buildings keep the World a living thing;
Without Buildings what within the World would spring?

These the Seven Things, they have been told in whole; —
Where thou passest to through all, there is the Goal!

E'en as Seven Veils are these, an thou enquire;
There whereto thou passest through dwells thy Desire.
Now thou needs must pass through these and onward go.
If thy strength vail not to pass, what shalt thou do? —
Hold thou fast by Love, 'tis surest guide for thee,
Passing thee through all to there where dwelleth He.
For that Love is far beyond all else that is,
And its realm Infinitude's dominion is,
He who goes with Love finds to The Truth the way;
Never shall he die, nay, he shall live for aye.
Whoso looks with Love into his dear one's face, —
Wheresoe'er he look, behold, what meets his gaze!
Glory therefore in thy Love, O Lover true;
'Tis through Love that man hath passed this Kingdom[1] through.
Whosoe'er hath Love for wings, forth let him go!
Heav'n forfend that he should bide on earth below!
O my God! may we ne'er lose the Narrow Way,
Never let us from Thy Love depart or stray.

[1] 'This Kingdom,' i. e. the stages in the physical world, the World of the Kingdom, that lead up to Man (see pp. 48 and 56).

CHAPTER II.

The Beginning of Secular Poetry.

Teftázání. Cadi Burhán-ud-Dín.

The earliest West-Turkish poets, the men whose work we have been considering, were all avowedly and exclusively mystics. But before the dawn of the fifteenth century a new note was struck, and secular, or at least quasi-secular, poetry — the eternal blending of love and religion renders dogmatising dangerous — made its appearance alongside of verse confessedly mystic and naught beside.

Before, however, we turn our attention to the valiant and adventurous Judge who, so far as we know, was the first to invoke the new spirit, we shall glance for a moment at a work which though only a translation calls for a brief mention in these pages.

In his article already referred to, Veled Chelebi, after a few remarks on ʿAshiq's Gharíb-Náme, goes on to say that the next work in Turkish poetry is a versified translation of Saʿdí's Bústán or 'Orchard' made in 755 (1354) by the great and famous Persian schoolman Saʿd-ud-Dín Mesʿúd-i Teftázání. Of this translation, I have seen no other mention; it is not referred to by either Kátib Chelebi or Von Hammer, nor is it spoken of in any work Oriental or European that has come under my notice. But Veled Chelebi says that he has examined it, and quotes a few of the opening lines as a specimen of its style. These show that Teftázání's version is in the same metre as the original and, if they are fairly representative of the whole, that his translation is very close. There are in Turkish several commentaries on the Bústán, notably those by Surúrí, Shemʿí, and Súdí, all of whom flourished in the sixteenth century; but I am not aware of any other translation.

Teftázání, the translator, is one of the greatest scholars of Islam; it is he who resuscitated Muhammedan learning after the torrent of Mongol invasion had well-nigh swept all vestige of culture from those lands. Indeed, his appearance is looked upon by the ʿulemá throughout the Muslim world as the central point in their history, the men of learning who preceded the great scholar being called 'the ancients,' while those who have succeeded him are styled 'the moderns.'

Teftázání was born in Khurásán in 722 (1322), and died in 792 (1390); he was held in high honour by Timur who, for all his ferocity, knew how to reverence the representatives of learning. [1]

[1] These are the lines quoted by Veled Chelebi from the opening of Teftázání's translation of the Bústán. The Persian student will observe how close they are to the original: —

دیرم آدین آنوك که یاراتدی جان * سوزی دلده حکمتدن ایتدی روان
دوشنلر الین دوتمق ایشیدور * کرمدن خطا عذرینی ایشیدور
بویون ویرمین پادشاهلر باشی * ایشیکنده سورونمك اولور ایشی
نه عاصی اولانلری قاتی دوتر * نه صوچی اولانلری کیرو ییتر

I pronounce the name of Him who hath created the soul,
Who through (His) wisdom hath made speech flow on the tongue.
To take the hand of the fallen is His work;
Through grace He hearkeneth the excuse of faults.
The heads of kings who bow not the neck, —
Their work is grovelling at His threshold.
He seizeth not violently the rebellious,
Neither doth He push off the guilty.

The date of the translation is given in this passage which occurs in the canto on 'The Reason of the Writing of the Book:' —

شو ییلده که دوزولدی اشبو کتاب * نبی هجرتندن صورولسه حساب
یدییوز و اللی بشیدی تمام * که تاریخی یزلو طوتر خاص و عام

And this year when this book was set out,
If the reckoning (thereof) from the Flight of the Apostle be asked,
It was seven hundred and fifty-five, exactly,
That the date thereof may high and low hold in writing.

From the days of the Mongol invasion till the time when Báyezíd the Thunderbolt brought the more westerly districts within the limits of the Ottoman Empire, the vast territories lying to the east of the Decarchy were in a state of seething anarchy. From Angora, which had been annexed by Murád I, away to the farthest limits of Azerbayjan was a welter of Turkman clans, ever at war with one another and with their neighbours, and owning no real allegiance to any ruler beyond their tribal chiefs. From out of this chaos there emerged in the last quarter of the fourteenth century four local Turkman dynasties named respectively the Qara-Qoyunlu or 'Black Sheep' at Erzerum, the Aq-Qoyunlu or 'White Sheep' at Diyár-Bekr,[1] the Zu-l-Qadr at Merʿash and the Bení-Ramazán at Adana.[2]

Somewhere about the time when the foundations of these little states were being laid, that is about the year 780 (1378), there was in the city of Erzinjan a very learned and accomplished Cadi or Judge named Ahmed Burhán-ud-Dín. Our information concerning the career of this remarkable man who, if not actually the first, was among the very earliest of the literary lyric poets[3] of the Western Turks,

[1] The Black Sheep and the White Sheep were so named from the devices on their standards.

[2] The Black Sheep dynasty existed for about seventy years when it succumbed to its rival the White Sheep which, in its turn, was overthrown by Shah Ismaʿíl of Persia early in the sixteenth century. The Zu-l-Qadr held out till the time of Sultan Selím I, the Bení-Ramazán till that of Suleymán I.

[3] I say 'literary' lyric poets in order to exclude men like Yúnus Imre, who, though lyric poets, wrote without regard to the rules of the literary art.

is derived chiefly from the biographical work entitled Ed-Durer-ul-Kámine or 'The Hidden Pearls' of the famous Arab historian Ibn-Hajar.[1] According to this contemporary writer, who is cited as their authority by Tash-köpri-záde, ʿAlí and Saʿd-ud-Dín, Cadi Burhán-ud-Dín, as the poet is usually called, having completed his studies in jurisprudence in the city of Aleppo which was then, along with all Syria, in the hands of the Memlúk Sultans of Egypt, returned to his native town of Erzinjan, where he speedily formed a close friendship with the Emír or King. This friendship between the Emír and the Cadi ripened into intimacy till at length the former gave Burhán-ud-Dín his daughter in marriage. After this, for some unrecorded reason, their friendship changed into hostility, and Burhán killed his father-in-law and made himself king in his stead. He then seized the districts of Siwas and Qaysaríya and joining them to that of Erzinjan, formed a little kingdom with himself as Sultan. Here he reigned, according to Saʿd-ud-Dín, for some twenty or thirty years, continually raiding the neighbourhood and fighting with the tribes round about.

In 789 (1387), Ibn-Hajar tells us, a powerful Egyptian army was sent against Burhán, to which he, though he knew opposition must be vain, being of a very courageous disposition, offered a valiant but unavailing resistance. In 799 (1396-7) he found himself hard pressed by some of the neighbouring Turkman tribes, whereupon he besought aid of his quondam enemy the Memlúk Sultan of Egypt, which, being granted, enabled him to overcome his foes. But towards

[1] Ibn-Hajar el-ʿAsqalání was born in Egypt in 773 (1371-2), and died there in 852 (1448-9). He is said to have written more than a hundred and fifty books. The full title of the work mentioned above is Ed-Durer-ul-Kámine fi Aʿyán-il-Miʾet-is-Sámine, 'The Hidden Pearls, concerning the Notables of the Eighth Century;' the book is a biographical dictionary of the prominent Muslims of the eighth century of the Hijre (A.D. 1300-1397).

the end of the following year 800 (that is the summer of 1398) he was killed in a great battle with the White Sheep chieftain Qara-ᶜOsmán the Black Leech. [1]

In his narration of the events of the reign of Báyezíd the Thunderbolt, Saᶜd-ud-Dín gives a somewhat different account of the end of Burhán-ud-Dín. According to the Ottoman historian, Sultan Báyezíd having heard of the pretensions and excesses of the upstart ruler of Siwas, set out against him at the head of a large army. Burhán, terrified at the approach of so formidable an antagonist, abandoned his capital and fled to some high and steep mountains in the neighbourhood of Kharput. Here he waited for a time, hoping that something would happen in the Ottoman dominions which would compel the Sultan to retire, and so allow him to return to his capital. Meanwhile his old enemy the Black Leech seeing Burhán's extremity to be his own opportunity, suddenly attacked the fugitive in his retreat, and there slew him after a desperate conflict. Thus when Báyezíd and his Ottomans arrived, they had nothing to do but take possession of Burhán's territories which were straightway incorporated with their own dominions, Zeyn-ul-ᶜÁbidín, Burhán's son, having previously been sent off to his sister's husband Nasír-ud-Dín Bey, the Zu-l-Qadr king of Merᶜash, by the people of Siwas who were desirous that no opposition should be offered to Báyezíd. [2]

[1] Qara-Iluk or Qara-Yuluk, the 'Black Leech,' is the surname given on account of his bloodthirstiness to Qara-ᶜOsmán, the grandson of Tur ᶜAlí Beg, the first recorded chieftain of the White Sheep clan.

[2] In this place Saᶜd-ud-Dín says there is some question as to the date of the death of Burhán-ud-Dín. He says that Molla Idrís mentions 794, but that he himself follows Ibn-Shuhne and Sheref-ud-Dín-i Yezdí who give 798, while Ibn-Hajar has 799. Saᶜd-ud-Dín here seems to forget that he had himself already given (in his notice on Burhán-ud-Dín among the learned men of Murád I's reign) 800 on the authority of Ibn-Hajar. This last date is further given in the ᶜIqd-ul-Jumán fi Táríkh-Ehl-iz-Zemán, 'The Necklace of

We have no particulars concerning the fatal quarrel between Burhán-ud-Dín and his father-in-law and so can say nothing as to how far, if at all, the former was justified in bringing about the Emír's death. But Tash-köpri-záde, following Ibn-Hajar, speaks of Burhán's seizure of the government of Erzinjan as 'the fruitage of the tree of craft and intrigue,' and this, taken in conjunction with the ambitious and aggressive temper which the Cadi-Sultan afterwards displayed, inclines one to suspect that this dim tragedy may have been in but too true harmony with the fierce spirit of that lawless age.

But be this as it may, all the authorities agree in lauding the learning and courage of the gifted and daring adventurer. When speaking of the resistance that he offered to the overwhelming forces of the Memlúks, Ibn-Hajar, as reported by Tash-köpri-záde, says, that although Burhán-ud-Dín knew it was impossible to stem the flood, yet his native valour impelled him to stand up against it; and farther on, when describing his character, he declares that 'courage and audacity were implanted in his nature, and he was passing brave and terrible, valorous and awful.' ᶜAyní, another almost contemporary Arab historian, says of him, 'his was bounty indescribable; but he busied himself with hearkening to instruments of music and with drinking things forbidden; and his is fair poetry in Arabic, in Turkish and in Persian; and he was a lord of high emprize, and he bowed not his head to the Lord of Egypt, nor yet to the Son of ᶜOsmán,[1] nor yet to Timur.'[2]

Pearls, concerning the History of the Men of the Time,' by another Arab historian, Bedr-ud-Dín ᶜAyní, who died in 855 (1451). Kátib Chelebi also gives 800 as the date of Cadi Burhán-ud-Dín's death.

[1] In direct contradiction to Saᶜd-ud-Dín's statement that Burhán fled on the approach of Báyezíd.

[2] In his Bibliographical Dictionary (vol. ii, p. 139) Kátib Chelebi mentions

The best-known of Cadi Burhán-ud-Dín's writings was his Terjíh, a commentary on the great work on the principles of jurisprudence called the Telmíh; both Tash-köpri-záde and Sa'd-ud-Dín speak of this commentary as being in high repute among the 'ulemá of their own time. Burhán wrote also a grammatical treatise which he called Iksír-us-Sa'ádet or 'The Elixir of Felicity;' but it is his poetry alone that concerns us here.

Tash-köpri-záde, presumably following Ibn-Hajar, says, 'Mevláná Burhán-ud-Dín was master of versification, and he was ranged and reckoned in the ranks of the poets.' On the same authority, Sa'd-ud-Dín and 'Alí say, the first, 'he was master of graceful verse;' the second, 'as were his culture and his learning, so were his poetry and his courage.' 'Ayní says, as we have seen, 'his is fair poetry in Arabic, in Turkish and in Persian.' And that is all; the Ottoman Tezkire-writers pass him over in silence. Von Hammer makes no mention of him. Not a line of this old poet was preserved by any chronicler; and in the world of letters, where he had played as bold a part as he had in that of politics, his was but the almost forgotten shadow of a name.

a special history of Cadi Burhán-ud-Dín under the title of تاريخ القاضى برهان الدين السيواسى 'The History of the Cadi Burhán-ud-Dín of Siwas.' He describes it thus: 'In four volumes; by the accomplished 'Abd-ul-'Azíz el-Baghdádí. Ibn-'Arab-Sháh relateth in his History that he ('Abd-ul-'Azíz) was a marvel of the age in verse and prose both in Arabic and Persian, and that he was the boon-companion of Sultan Ahmed el-Jeláyirí at Baghdad. On his (the Cadi's) alighting thereat (at Baghdad), the Cadi besought him ('Abd-ul-'Azíz) of him (Sultan Ahmed), and he (Ahmed) refused, and set up those who kept watch over him ('Abd-ul-'Azíz); and he ('Abd-ul-'Azíz) desired to go, and he laid his clothes on the bank of the Tigris and plunged in, and he came out at another place and joined his companions who had thought him drowned. And he was honoured and esteemed by the Cadi, and he wrote for him a fair history, and he narrated therein from the beginning of his affairs till near his death; and it is more beautiful than the History of 'Utba in its subtle phrases. And after the death of the Cadi he departed to Cairo, and there he fell from a roof and died, his ribs being broken.'

Little, if any, attention had been paid to the brief passages just quoted from the medieval historians till in 1890 the British Museum acquired from the executors of Mr. Thomas Fiott Hughes, a former Oriental Secretary to the British Embassy in Constantinople, who had there made a collection of Eastern books, a large and magnificent manuscript containing the Díwán of Cadi Burhán-ud-Dín.[1] This volume, which, as far as is known, is unique, was written in 798 (1395-6), two years before the author's death. On several grounds it seems not improbable that this manuscript was prepared for Burhán-ud-Dín himself. The date would favour such an hypothesis, while the beauty and richness of the decoration show that the volume was destined for some great personage. The scribe, who was certainly a client of Burhán's, calls himself Khalíl bin Ahmed el-Melekí es-Sultání, that is, Khalíl, the son of Ahmed, the Royalist, the Sultanist. By way of descriptive title he prefixes to the volume this sentence in Arabic: 'of the Words of the Sultan, the Wise, the Just, the Gracious, the Bounteous, in whom are manifest the Apostolic Virtues, in whom is manifest the Mustafavian Faith,[2] the Sultan of Sultans, the Essence of the Water and the Earth, the Proof[3] of the Truth and of the World and of the Faith, the strengthened with the strength of the One the Sempiternal, the Lord of Victory, Ahmed, the son of Muhammed, — may God eternalize his Empire and manifest his Proof unto the Worlds!' This panegyric is clearly the work of a courtier, and reads very much as though the volume had been intended for the library of the royal poet. In the same key are the brief phrases such as, 'And by him: be his kingdom eternalized!'[4] 'And by him: be his fortune

[1] Or. 4126.

[2] Mustafà is one of the names of the Prophet Muhammed.

[3] The word Burhán means 'Proof;' Burhán-ud-Dín, 'Proof of the Faith.'

[4] و له خلد ملكه.

increased!'[1] which the copyist has prefixed to each ghazel.

Burhán-ud-Dín is the earliest West-Turkish lyric poet of whose work we can speak with any confidence; as save for a few lines preserved by the biographers, the writings of his contemporary Niyází — of whom more by and by — have disappeared. His Díwán is thus the oldest monument of the literary lyric poetry of the Western Turks that remains to us; but it is more, it is in all probability practically the first collection of such that was made; as even should we eventually find the Díwán of the poet just mentioned, it would at best be contemporary, not earlier.

The volume consists of two sections, the first and by far the larger containing the ghazels, the second containing firstly twenty rubá'ís and secondly a much larger number of detached quatrains described as tuyughát.[2] Two points are to be noticed concerning the ghazels as differentiating this from later collections. The first of these is that the alphabetical arrangement universal in subsequent díwáns is here ignored, the poems following one another seemingly at hap-hazard, no order of any kind being observable. The second is that the poet never mentions his own name; the custom of using a makhlas or pen-name had not yet been introduced among the Turks.

We find in the ghazels the same prosodial peculiarity that we have noted in the mesnevís of Veled and 'Ashiq, namely, that while the metres are Persian, the feet are sometimes quantitative, sometimes syllabic. Here, however, the position of the two principles is reversed; it is the Persian or quantitative that is the more usual, the Turkish or syllabic falling into the second place. What may have been the case with

[1] و له زید دولته .

[2] Tuyughát is a pseudo-Arabic plural form of the East-Turkish word tuygh.

Niyází's ghazels we cannot say, but in those of the lyric poets, Ahmed-i Dáʿí, Ahmedí and Nesímí, who also were contemporaries of Burhán, though the bulk of their work is probably subsequent to Timur's invasion, we find the Persian system alone observed, and, moreover, fully accepted in its every detail. Burhán's is therefore the only díwán of literary ghazels we have which was completed, even to receiving the last touches it ever got, prior to the development that synchronised with the Tartar inroad; and consequently these ghazels are the only known poems of their class which present that compromise between the Persian and Turkish prosodial systems so distinctive of the earlier portion of the First Period. In the rubáʿís the Persian method is more consistently followed. These rubáʿís are probably the first ever written in the Turkish language.

Cadi Burhán-ud-Dín is, so far as I know, the only literary poet among the Western Turks who has made use of the old native verse-form called Tuyugh. This, as may be remembered, is identical in rhyme-arrangement with the rubáʿí or quatrain; that is to say, it is a short poem of four lines, the first, second and third of which rhyme together.[1] But it is not written in any of the Persian rubáʿí metres, being composed in lines of eleven syllables which are of course always scanned in the Turkish syllabic style.[2] It is curious to note how in his tuyughs Burhán goes out of his way to be as much of a Turkman as he can. His ghazels and rubáʿís are written in a pure, though somewhat peculiar, West-Turkish dialect, but the tuyughs abound with East-Turkish words and grammatical forms which he uses nowhere else. In writing in what is essentially an East-Turkish form he

[1] See p. 90.

[2] The cadence corresponds to the Persian Hexametric Remel: —

— ∪ — — | — ∪ — — | — ∪ —

seems to have very properly thought that it behoved him as an artist to express himself so far as might be in the fashion of his Central Asian kinsfolk.

The sentiment and manner of Burhán's poetry are of course Persian; he learned, as was inevitable, from the only masters who were there to teach; and in his own way he learned his lesson quite as well as most of his more famous successors. It would perhaps not be quite fair to charge his Persian instructors with entire responsibility for all the gems of rhetoric that glitter in his verses, seeing that according to no less an authority than Mír ᶜAlí Shír, [1] it is becoming to employ the tejnís or 'homonym' in the tuyugh, — a statement which seems to point to a native and inborn yearning after such pretty playthings. Burhán is indeed the first West-Turkish poet to pay serious attention to the art that is called Bedíᶜ. Homonyms of many varieties, prominent among which is the favourite merfú or 'repaired,' meet us at every turn; while of course the popular arrangement of an internal sub-rhyme is well to the fore.

Daring and original as Burhán-ud-Dín shows himself in his attempt to write West-Turkish lyrics in both the Persian and the East-Turkish styles, he proves himself no less so in his choice of subject. He is, as we have hinted, the first of the Western Turks to break away from the religious circle — be it mystic or philosophic — in which all the poetry of his people has hitherto revolved. Burhán is before all else a love-poet, the first love-poet of Turkish Asia Minor. 'He busied himself with listening to instruments of music and with drinking things forbidden,' says ᶜAyní; but if the verses do at all reflect the singer, the delights of love must have claimed quite as much of his attention. Though from time

[1] Mír ᶜAlí Shír-i Newá'í, the famous East-Turkish poet and man of letters of the fifteenth century who has been mentioned on p. 127.

to time the mystic note is discernible, this comes faintly, as it were an echo from without; the true voice of the poet is heard in the praises of his mistress, glorying in the joy of her presence, wailing in the desolation of her absence.

To speak authoritatively concerning the literary side of Burhán-ud-Dín's work would demand a careful study of his dialect as well as a more intimate acquaintance with the bulk of his poetry than I have had time to acquire. It is, however, clear that his conception of poetry was quite different from that of such men as Veled and ʿAshiq. To these verse was a vehicle — the most suitable and convenient they knew — for the exposition of their theory of existence; to Burhán it was before aught else an art, a field for the exercise of his wit and ingenuity. In direct opposition to his predecessors, he delighted in adorning his lines with all he knew of grace and fantasy; and in so far he, rather than any of them, is the true herald of the great army that is to come. That he had a genuine love of his art is self-evident; otherwise he never could have found leisure amid the cares and excitements of his busy and eventful life to produce so great a quantity of verse. This fecundity is the more remarkable in that he had no similar Turkish work behind him. The verse of his mystic predecessors was not of a nature to help here; such models as he had must have been exclusively Persian. His poems may have little to commend them on the score of actual accomplishment, but surely it is no mean achievement for a man who had to hold by the sword from hour to hour the kingdom he had created for himself, to have caught something of the spirit and the art of a foreign poetry and to have embodied thi for the first time in an almost uncultivated language. [1]

[1] An essay on the British Museum MS. of Cadi Burhán-ud-Dín' along with the text and a translation of the twenty rubáʿís and

In the following translations it has been possible to suggest some of the homonyms and other figures that form so prominent a feature of Burhán-ud-Dín's verses; many, however, have had to be passed over unnoticed. The enormous difference between these verses and everything that has gone before will be apparent at once even through the veil of translation.

Ghazel. [13]

Thy ruby lips [1] unto the sugar-bale [2] have wroughten bale,
And made this parrot-heart [3] of mine in melody to wail.

I flung my heart, ah, woe is me, upon her heart's pathway;
To save the vial cast against the stone, whate'er may vail? [4]

She bent her eyebrow-bow and notched the arrow of her eye; [5]
It seemeth then she would yon Turks [6] unto this battle [7] hail.

the tuyughs, was published in 1895 by a Russian scholar, M. Melioranski; but as this gentleman elected to write entirely in the Russian language, his work is of little use outside his own country.

[1] The 'ruby lips' — often contracted to 'the rubies' — of a beauty is a common-place of Persian and old Turkish poetry.

[2] The 'sugar-bale' typifies sweetness.

[3] The 'Parrot' is often mentioned by the poets, but not, as with us, to typify ignorant repetition; what the Easterns associate with this bird is, firstly, its faculty of learning human speech, and, secondly, the beauty of its plumage. When Burhán speaks of his 'parrot-heart' he means to imply that his heart has been taught to speak or indite in verse by the charms of his mistress.

[4] The 'glass vial' represents the tender heart of the lover; the 'stone,' the hard heart of the beauty, — when these are thrown together the former must needs be broken. The metaphor is not unusual.

[5] The 'eyebrow-bow' and the 'arrow' of the eye or glance are among the commonest of common-places.

[6] The eyes or glances of a beauty are often compared by the Persian poets to 'Turks,' the latter being known to the Persians as people of handsome appearance and at the same time as bold marauders. They thus resemble the beloved's eyes which are beautiful and yet steal the heart. Sometimes the beloved herself is called a 'Turk,' for the same reasons. The Ottomans and other Turkish peoples simply took over this fancy with the rest of the Per-

Her tresses and her locks do burn my soul like aloes-wood,[1]
For this her rule with whatsoe'er she may to clutch avail.

O skinker, give into her hand the brimming bowl and see
The charm and seemliness she adds unto the wine vermeil.[2]

Ghazel. [14]

O thou, white of chin! and O thou, black of hair!
A myriad the tangles thy dark tresses bear.

What though that the tongue of the taper be long,
Its place is the lantern through thy radiance fair.[3]

sian paraphernalia, but it is not of very frequent occurrence in their verse. Háfiz of Shíráz, the great Persian lyric poet, alludes to it in the opening couplet of one of the best known of his ghazels: —

اگر آن ترک شیرازی بدست آرد دل ما را
بخال هندویش بخشم سمرقند و بخارا را

If yon Shirazian Turk would deign to bear this heart o' mine in hand,
I'd give unto her Indian mole Bokhárá-town and Samarcand.

The phrase 'to bear so and so's heart in one's hand,' means 'to make much of so and so,' 'to show him favours.' In the second line the beauty's mole, which is of course black, is imagined as her Indian slave, and the poet declares that if the lady were but kind to him, he would, in the exuberance of his gratitude, give the cities of Bokhárá and Samarcand as a 'tip' to her black slave (her black mole).

[1] The battle waged to capture lovers' hearts.

[1] Aloes-wood is burned for the fragrant incense-like perfume it produces. The black locks of the beauty are like the black charcoal in the censer on which the aloes-wood is laid to be burned. There is in this couplet a series of untranslatable íhámś or 'amphibologies;' the word 'úd meaning both 'aloes-wood' and 'lute;' qánún, 'rule' and 'dulcimer;' ney, 'whatsoever' and 'flute;' chenk, 'clutch' and 'harp;' but I cannot make any clear sense out of the verse taking these words as the names of musical instruments.

[2] By her reflection falling on it, or merely by her holding it, or perhaps by the fact that it will taste sweeter when drunk in her sweet company.

[3] The 'tongue' of the taper is the wick. 'To extend the tongue,' is a phrase meaning 'to be talkative,' generally, in a bad sense. The idea in the verse is that though the taper or candle (one of the conventional symbols for a bright and smiling beauty) { may burn brilliantly with a long wick, / may boastfully call attention to its own lustre, } it is

Distraught and bewildered the soul for her locks, —
It maketh the nook of her eye its repair. [1]

Mine eyes they are Jaᶜfer (yea, e'en as her lips), —
Huseyn and Hasan are the twain of them there. [2]

I'll waste to a hair for her hair-waist my frame, —
The Uweys-i Qaren [3] of her path will I fare.

Ghazel. [15]

How shall I live on, ah, how, afar from thee?
Know not I what I shall do, afar from thee.

O my Liege, from forth mine eyen pour the tears;
Poor am I, as beggar low, afar from thee.

left unheeded in the candlestick or lantern when thy far brighter radiance shines forth, i. e. when thou gracest the banquet with thy lovely presence.

[1] The eye of a beauty is conceived as restless, ever making assault upon the hearts of lovers. So my soul knows no peace, — it is distraught for her hair, yet it can fly for refuge only to her restless eye.

[2] The poet here likens his eyes, stained with the tears of blood shed for his love, to the red lips of his mistress, and to the early martyrs in their gory raiment. Jaᶜfer-i Tayyár, the brother of ᶜAlí, died fighting for the Prophet at Múta. Huseyn and Hasan are the sons of ᶜAlí and the grandsons of the Prophet. Huseyn was slain in the famous Battle of Kerbelá, while Hasan was killed in Medína. Possibly Burhán may have had in his mind the Hadís, 'Whoso dieth for Love, verily he dieth a martyr,' مَنْ مَاتَ مِنَ ٱلْعِشْقِ فَقَدْ مَاتَ شَهِيدًا There is further an íhám or amphibology in the word jaᶜfer, which besides being a proper name, means 'a stream,' to which the poet may aptly compare his weeping eyes.

[3] Uweys-i Qarení (or Qaren), i. e. Uweys of the tribe of Qaren, a famous saint of the early days of Islam, was a native of Yemen. Though contemporary with the Prophet, he never saw him; but having heard that he had lost one of his teeth, and not knowing which, he broke all his own to make sure that the same one was gone. He was killed in battle in 37 (658), fighting alongside of ᶜAlí, the Prophet's son-in-law, against the usurper Muᶜáwíya. Burhán's idea is that he will waste his own body till it becomes very thin and so resembles his beloved's waist, in like manner as Uweys-i Qaren knocked out his own teeth in order to resemble the Prophet whom he loved.

Thou wouldst have my heart, I give my life instead;
Hard I'd hurt my heart all through, afar from thee.

Sad and woeful for each hair that thou dost wear;
To a hair I'd wear me too, afar from thee.

Lo, my eyes have entered my heart's blood, alack!
Fain of my eyes' blood I go, afar from thee. [1]

To thy life my life is joined, O beauty bright,
Like unto a veil I show, afar from thee. [2]

Far from thee, ah, far from thee, I burn alway;
Think not I am heedless, no, afar from thee.

Ghazel. [16]

See how yon dearest one again on us a ruse hath played, —
To turn our tears to blood [3] she hath her cheek with rouge o'erlaid. [4]

Since I have seen that mouth of hers my life hath been a doubt; [5]
Since she hath shown that waist of hers she 's turned me to a shade. [6]

[1] The old idea was that tears are really blood which undergoes a process of distillation and so is turned into water; but as there is only a limited store of this water, if one weep much it is exhausted, and pure, undistilled blood comes from the eyes in its place. Thus to weep 'tears of blood' is a very common expression meaning to weep long and bitterly.

Burhán would suggest in this verse that he has wept away all his stock of tears of water, and that his heart has been melted for stress of love and become blood, which blood is now issuing in tears from his eyes.

[2] i. e. my soul is joined to thy soul though my separate personality is interposed between us.

[3] 'Tears of blood,' see above, n. 1.

[4] i. e. she has adorned herself so as to increase the stress of our desire. There is further a suggested association between the redness of the cosmetic with which she has painted her face and the redness of the tears of blood we are to shed through our passionate yearning therefor.

[5] Smallness of mouth is one of the charms of the conventional beauty; this is sometimes exaggerated so that the fair one's mouth is called an atom or monad (jevher-i ferd, see p. 67, n. 1.) The analogy in the present line is between the smallness (as it were to vanishing point) of the beloved's mouth and the unsubstantiality (as it were even to the immateriality of a doubt) to

Her eyes my soul subduing, her ears my heart undoing,
Her words as honey flowing, my reason dumb have made.

Her absence I can bear not, her union I may share not, —
Yon Idol's [1] 'fore whose face doth plenilune to crescent fade.

God's grace that beauty is which she to us unlawful makes;
How is it lawful for her eyne her lover's blood to shed? [2]

A wand'ring vagrant is the wind since playing in her hair;
Not all ungrounded are the tales that thereanent are spread.

For all that at the fire of love of her she broiled the soul,
The moisture of her lip as cooling water she purveyed. [3]

Ghazel. [17]

Is not her love the soul within this lifeless frame of me?
And yet, and yet, is not the heart sore smitten by her e'e?

My heart hath girt it round with love of her upon her path;
Will not the door whereat with love one knocketh opened be? [4]

which yearning for this has worn the lover. Or yearning for her mouth, which is so small that its existence is doubtful, has so preyed upon my life that its existence has become doubtful likewise.

[6] Slenderness of waist is another of the conventional points in a beauty. The analogy here parallels that in the preceding line; it is between the slightness of her waist and the slightness of the measure of life to which desire therefor has reduced the lover.

[1] The beloved is often called an 'Idol' as being the object of the lover's adoration. There was moreover an idea, perhaps derived from the images and pictures in Christian churches, that an idol was a thing of beauty.

[2] Her beauty is the grace of God, and being the grace of God, is lawful for all; yet by denying it to us she acts as though the grace of God were unlawful for us. Since she is so scrupulous as to make unlawful what is really lawful, how can she hold it lawful to shed blood, an action which is wholly unlawful?

[3] i. e. she tempered her rigour with some kindness.

[4] As says the Arabic hemistich which has passed into a proverb: —

وَ مَنْ دَقَّ بَابَ ٱلْكَرِيمِ ٱنْفَتَحَ

'And whoso knocketh at the door of the generous, it will be opened (unto him).'

No riddle deem thou that the which her eyelashes have wrought;
Construed within the heart is not their cruel tyranny?

Though Noah reached his thousandth year, a thousand years it took;[1]
Hath not the twinkling of an eye vouchsafed this age to me?[2]

The Lover and the One Belov'd are one through fire of Love;
Is not the Lauder the Belauded then in verity?

Ghazel. [18]

O fairest one! O fairest one! O fairest!
Thy words the Stream of Life,[3] thy love the clearest.

I drunken am, and save thy ruby liplets
Is none may heal the ill they've wroughten, dearest.[4]

Oh what shall we? — thy tresses rest them never!
What do with these that rest not, fluttering rarest?

Behind us let us cast what nothing boots us,
And let us hale the thing that boots us nearest.

Here are a few of the rubá'ís, which are interesting as being, as we have said, probably the earliest Turkish experiments in this form.

[1] In the Koran, xix, 13, we read, 'And we sent Noah to his people, and he dwelt among them for a thousand years save fifty years; and the deluge overtook them while they were unjust.'

[2] The poet here means to say that while it took Noah a thousand years to attain the age of a thousand, he himself has gained all the knowledge, experience and pleasure that would be won in a life of that length in the twinkling of an eye, i. e. { in one glance of the beloved's eye / in a single moment.

[3] The legendary Stream or Fountain of Life, references to which are of constant occurrence, has already been mentioned, p. 172, n. 1. The mouth of the beloved is often compared to this Fountain, and the words issuing thence to the Water of Life that flows therefrom.

[4] Love of her ruby lips has made him drunk or beside himself, so it is their kiss alone that can cure him.

Rubá'í. [19]

I said: That I thy lip shall drain, may it be?
To this my pain, assain or bane may it be?
To union winning not, I am fallen far off;
In dreams that I thy lip shall drain, may it be?

Rubá'í. [20]

What hurt were I made glad by union with thee?
And should I win not, what lack wouldst thou see?
Wound would I my heart, yea, to shreds it tear,
Knew I thy ruby lip the salve therefor would be.

Rubá'í. [21]

Again for yon Leylí is my heart Mejnún-wode,[1]
Again for yon dearling are my tears Jeyhún-flood.[2]
May it be that her lips have torn this heart of mine? —
I looked, and behold, betwixen them was there blood![3]

Rubá'í. [22]

Said I: Thy lip! Said she: How sweet he speaks!
Said I: Thy waist! Said she: How neat he speaks!
Said I: My Soul, be all a ransom for thy locks!
Said she: This lack-all! of his wealth how feat he speaks![4]

[1] Mejnún and his beloved Leylí are the Romeo and Juliet of Eastern romance and poetry; we shall learn their history in detail later on.

[2] The Jeyhún is the River Oxus.

[3] This is an instance of the figure Husn-i Ta'líl, see p. 113. The poet here suggests that the moisture and redness of his beloved's lips are due to the blood of his heart which they have wounded.

[4] His speech is 'sweet' because it is of her lip which is sweetness itself; it is 'neat' because it is of her waist which is so slight and dainty. The last line is sarcastic: 'this poor lover who has naught speaks yet of giving all things as a ransom for my hair.'

Rubá'í. [23]

Said she: Why thine eyen weeping fain do I see?
And why thy heart full of pain do I see?
Said I: O Idol, 'tis for this, that thy lip
I see not always, but only now and then do I see!

Rubá'í. [24]

Thy lips for my soul the cure or bane do I see?
Thine eyes' wound [1] the salve my heart to assain do I see?
Love's fire, the which doth burn up Either World, [2]
Weak for my heart alone and vain do I see. [3]

Rubá'í. [25]

The heart for thine eyes to fragments torn must be;
The soul in thy locks distraught and lorn must be.
For him who is hapless in thy hair, the balm,
O Idol, from thy liplet born must be.

Rubá'í. [26]

Life for your Loved give! ye who Lovers be!
Who seeks a Love nor gives his life, — a child is he!
Though all the world be gathered on the Judgment-plain,
To me 'twill be a void so I but win to thee!

[1] i. e. the wound dealt by thine eyes, — this is really a salve to my heart.
[2] 'Either World,' the Here and the Hereafter, the Worlds Spiritual and Material, Real and Phenomenal; the various significations are generally resent together in the mind when the poets use the phrase.
[3] i. e. of all phenomena the heart alone can bear the mighty burden and stress of Love.

Tuyugh. [1] [27]

That which God, or yet time was, hath writ, shall be;
Whatsoe'er the eye 's to see, 'twill surely see.
Refuge take we in The Truth in Either World;
What is Tokhtamish [2] or Halt Timur [3] to me?

Tuyugh. [28]

Thanks to God, 'tis now of heroes bold the day;
All the world doth view the age with sore affray.
From the land where sinks the sun to where it springs
Flies within one breath the man of Love [4] straightway.

Tuyugh. [29]

That on earth I have no share, full well I know.
Ah, from no one but my dearling comes my woe.
Hope is leader still in Either World, for sooth
Other store than that there is not here below.

Tuyugh. [30]

Beauties like to thee within the world are few;
'Coquetry' thine air the which I held for 'True.' [5]

[1] The eight Tuyughs translated here are among those printed by M. Melioranski whose selection is as good and representative as any other that might be made.

[2] Tokhtamish is Burhán's form of Toqtamish, the name of the last of the Qipchaq Khans. This famous Prince, among whose exploits was the sack of Moscow, was eventually overthrown by Timur. He died, according to Sir H. Howorth's 'History of the Mongols' in 1406, according to Sámí Bey in 799 (1396-7).

[3] 'Halt Timur;' the great conqueror walked with a limp, the result of an arrow-wound, whence the Persians call him Timur-i Leng or 'Timur the Lame,' which is the original of our corrupt forms Tamerlane and Tamburlaine.

[4] 'The man of Love,' i. e. the mystic lover.

[5] Shehnáz i. e. 'Coquetry,' and Rást i. e. 'True,' are the names of two of

For the partridge-hearts there is no hawk on earth
Save thy falcon-eyne that fierce and swift pursue.

Tuyugh. [31]

Pity 'twere if aught hid in the heart remain;[1]
Life and Death do still the self-same beaker drain.
At the wild carouse of earth is Either World
By the man of Love as but one goblet ta'en.

Tuyugh. [32]

All our works and deeds before The Truth are known,
All the lawful and unlawful we have done.
O cupbearer, give to us the brimming bowl,
That the stain of rust[2] from off our heart be gone.

Tuyugh. [33]

Youthful charmer like to thee I ne'er did see;
Let the soul, the world, be sacrifice for thee.
Did there reach us of thy grace one single drop,
'Fore that drop a myriad seas one drop would be.

Tuyugh. [34]

With that dearling we've made merry all the night,
With that roguish fair whose riever glances smite.

the Oriental musical notes and also of two well-known melodies; they are used here amphibologically, the literal and technical senses both being kept in view.

[1] This probably means that it were a matter for regret should any ill-feeling against another be harboured in the heart, life being so uncertain and the world so small a thing.

[2] 'Rust' is constantly used figuratively for sorrow, the idea being that sorrow eats into the heart, which is compared to a mirror, as rust does into the metal mirrors that were used in those days.

Come then, up, and let us do by her anon
What we never yet have done by any wight!

Tuyugh. [35]

Still the lover's heart doth burn and burn alway;
Still the stranger's eyes are weeping weeping aye.
Longs the devotee for prayer and prayer-niche; [1]
He who is a man, he craves the field of fray.

[1] The mihráb or prayer-niche in a mosque indicates the direction of Mekka whither the faithful turn when worshipping. It corresponds in a manner to the altar in a Christian church.

CHAPTER III.

THE FIRST OTTOMAN POETS.

Ahmed. Niyází. Suleymán Chelebi.

So far not one of the poets whose acquaintance we have made has been an Ottoman Turk. Several have been of Persian extraction, while all those of Turkish race have been born outside the limits of the Osmanic State. It would seem that until the days of Báyezíd the Thunderbolt, who reigned from 792 (1390)[1] to 805 (1403), there were practically no poets within the Ottoman borders. ʿÁlí finds a reason for this in the fact that almost all the subjects of the earliest Sultans were either rude Turkish or Tartar warriors or else the children of recent converts from Christianity, none of whom possessed so much as the taste for poetry, far less the culture needful to produce it.

[1] Many authorities place the accession of Báyezíd I in 791 (1389); but the late Ghálib Edhem Bey, the learned and accomplished author of the Taqwím-i Meskúkát-i ʿOsmánîya (Essai de Numismatique Ottomane) and other valuable works, who went carefully into the question, came to the conclusion that the true date is 792 (1390).

Before turning our attention to the two poets who are mentioned as having lived under Báyezíd, we must glance for a moment at a dim form that looms scarce discernible through the thick mists of antiquity and oblivion.

Utterly ignoring all the writers mentioned in the preceding chapters (possibly because they were not Ottoman subjects) ᶜÁshiq Chelebi, in the Introduction to his Tezkire, declares that there was no Turkish poetry in Rúm during the reigns of ᶜOsmán and Orkhan.[1] But, he says, there arose in the time of the third sultan, Murád I, who reigned from 761 (1359) to 792 (1390), a certain Ahmed who wrote in the metre of the Sháh-Náme[2] a romantic mesneví which he called Suheyl u Nev-Bahár or 'Canopus and Vere.' This book, to which or to the author of which I have seen no other reference, was, ᶜÁshiq tells us, even in his time extremely rare. He had, however, seen a copy in his youth, and is thus able to inform his readers that although the author translated from the Persian, he is not without some original ideas of his own, and that his phraseology is, according to the wont of his time, painfully 'Turkish.' So fascinated was ᶜÁshiq by the Persian culture of his own day that this quality of being Turkish is in his eyes a grievous

[1] We have seen that ᶜÁshiq enters Yúnus Imre in his proper place in his Tezkire, but without mentioning any date. Probably, like ᶜAlí later on, he was content to let matters rest as they had been left by Tash-köpri-záde, who, as we know, placed Yúnus among the men of Sultan Báyezíd's time.

[2] The most popular of the Mutaqárib forms:

⏑ – – | ⏑ – – | ⏑ – – | ⏑ – || ⏑ – – | ⏑ – – | ⏑ – – | ⏑ –

blemish, a species of barbarism, such as our eighteenth century writers, moved by a similar spirit, would have called Gothicism; and, indeed, it is to the presence of this that he attributes the neglect into which the old poem had fallen. 'Belike,' he says, 'for that it had no face to show itself to the folk, its station is behind the curtain; for it is not that its face is veiled by reason of beauty and comeliness.'

ʿAshiq quotes one couplet, descriptive of night, from this earliest of West-Turkish metrical romances. [1]

[1] It is this: —

یاوی وارسه کرك کوزت اول دمی * زمـرّد دکـزده بـو التون کمی

The true sense of the first line of this couplet is not determinable owing to the absence of the context: the following rendering is merely conjectural: —

His (her, its, their) enemy (harm) must exist (arrive); watch that moment, —
On the emerald sea this golden ship.

The second line seems to refer to the crescent moon in the evening sky. This quotation shows that, as we should have expected, the Turkish prosodial system prevailed in this poem.

Of the two poets, Niyází and Suleymán, who flourished under Sultan Báyezíd, the first is a scarcely more substantial figure than the shadowy singer of 'Canopus and Vere.'

Latífí, the earliest of our authorities, makes this old poet a native of Brusa; in this he is followed by ᶜÁlí and Riyází, the former of whom, however, mentions a report that Niyází was by origin a Qaraman Turk, while Hasan Chelebi declares him to have come from Seres in Rumelia. This question of his birthplace is the only point in Niyází's biography touched on by the chroniclers, and here, as we see, they are sufficiently at variance. For the rest, they confine themselves to saying that the poet left a complete Díwán of Turkish and Persian qasídas and ghazels which he dedicated to Báyezíd the Thunderbolt, in whose praise most of his verses were written.

Niyází was the earliest Ottoman lyric writer, the fore-runner, as ᶜÁlí says, of 'the ancient poets' Ahmedí and Sheykhí; and although his works have long since disappeared, it would seem that he was not without influence on the development of Turkish poetry. Thus Latífí tells us, and his statement is endorsed by Hasan and ᶜÁlí, that most of the qasídas of Ahmed Pasha, the first great Ottoman lyric poet and the inaugurator of the Second Period, are nazíras or 'parallels' to poems of Niyází's. Latífí particularises four of the Pasha's best-known qasídas which he says were thus suggested by poems of this early precursor; [1] and he further declares that

[1] Those having for redíf the words, Laᶜl or 'Ruby,' Áftáb or 'Sun,' Shikár or 'Chase,' and Áb or 'Water;' this statement of Latífí's is reproduced by Hasan and ᶜÁlí.

the most famous of all Ahmed's works, namely the qasída descriptive of the Palace of Sultan Mehemmed the Conqueror, was modelled verse for verse upon a highly elaborated poem of Niyází's that had the same rhyme and metre. [1]

Niyází would thus seem to be, as Latífí maintains he is, the introducer of the Persian artistic lyric into Rúm. No doubt Cadi Burhán-ud-Dín was at least as early in the field; but his work is different in intention, he did not seek to substitute in poetry Persian for Turkish canons of art; whereas it would appear that Niyází did, and for this reason the literary poets of Turkey are justified in regarding him as their true precursor.

Niyází's Díwán, if it was ever popular, seems to have soon fallen from general favour. Latífí, who wrote barely a century and a half after the poet's time, says that his book was even then very rare, and his work in consequence forgotten among the people. Hasan Chelebi, writing forty years later, has the same story; he says that 'with the passing of the seasons and the ages the words of the poet have been forgotten and lost to mind, so that he might be described

[1] As an example Latífí quotes the following verse from Ahmed Pasha's Palace Qasída: —

آهوی فلك کوردی ساحر شیر لواکی
خون جکرندن دم صبح اولدی دم آلا

The fawn-heaven beheld at dawn thy lion-banner,
And at daybreak was it tail-fouled by its liver's blood.

which he says was modelled on this couplet from Niyází's poem: —

آهوی فلك چرخ پلنکندن امین در
شیر علمك سایهسنی ایدهلی ملجا

The fawn-heaven is safe from the leopard-sphere
Since it hath made the shadow of thy lion-banner its refuge.

with the description: He is not a thing that is mentioned.'[1] ʿAlí's assertion that the Díwán was lost in the confusion caused by Timur's invasion is less probable than the statement of the earlier authorities that it disappeared through neglect. If ʿAlí's story were true, Ahmed Pasha could not have made use of the Díwán, seeing that his poems were not written till half a century after the cataclysm at Angora.

Latífí quotes two couplets from an Arabic-Persian mulemmaʿ qasída of Niyází's in praise of Sultan Báyezíd, the Turkish distich quoted in the note on page 229, and this other couplet, also in Turkish: —

From out thy tresses' night, O love, the sun may rise on me,[2]
If true indeed the ancient saying 'night is pregnant'[3] be.[4]

The couplet just translated is quoted also by Hasan, ʿAlí and Belígh, the last two of whom have this verse in addition:

What warders were her eyebrows for the garden of her grace?[5]
For they've taken two marauders, yet they fondly these embrace![6]

[1] A quotation from the Koran, lxxvi, 1. 'Cometh there not on man a moment in time when he is not a thing that is mentioned?'

[2] i. e. thy sun-bright face may shine on me from out thy night-black hair, i. e. thou mayest some day vouchsafe to me thy favours.

[3] اَللَّيْلَةُ حُبْلَى 'night is pregnant,' i. e. we know not what the morrow may bring forth, is a famous Arabic proverb often quoted by the poets. It sometimes appears in the Turkish form كيجه‌لر كبه. In Turkish idiom 'the sun shall rise' is 'the sun shall be born;' hence the congruity of the quoted proverb.

[4] زلفك كيجه‌سندن باشومه كون طوغه يارا
تاحقيق ايسه كر نكتة اللياة حبلى

[5] There is an untranslatable amphibology in this line, the word hájib meaning both 'warder' and 'eyebrow.'

[6] The 'garden of her grace' is her fair face; the 'marauders' are her eyes. which the { warders / eyebrows } instead of casting into prison, have taken to their embrace. The Turkish is: —

ابروسى نيجه حاجب اوله حسنى باغنه
المش ايكى حرامى‌يى ايكى قوجاغنه

In these few stray lines we see all of Niyází's work that has come down to us. [1]

[1] ʿAshiq omits Niyází altogether. Riyázi, who wrote as late as the beginning of the seventeenth century, would have us believe that Niyází flourished, not under Báyezíd I, but under Báyezíd II who reigned from 886 (1481) to 918 (1512). He says that he has seen Niyází's Díwán, and that most of the qasídas are parallels to poems of Ahmed Pasha — thus reversing the statement of the earlier writers. In a marginal note to my MS. of Riyází's Tezkire it is said that Niyází declares in one of his qasídas that he is writing it as a parallel to one of Ahmed's, that in some of his poems he mentions the Sultan as Báyezíd the son of Mehemmed (which would of course indicate Báyezíd II), and that he died in 900 (1494-5). It is further said that Hasan Chelebi fell into error through copying Latífí. The origin of the error is pronounced to be the fact that the Sultan is called Yildirim Báyezíd (i. e. Báyezíd the Thunderbolt) in some of the qasídas; but 'Yildirim' the writer declares was the original style of Báyezíd II (as well as the surname of Báyezíd I), in proof of which very dubious assertion he cites this line which he says comes from the Silsilet-uz-Zeheb of the Persian poet Jámí: —

بایزید الدرم شه دوران

'Báyezíd Ildirim the King of the Age.'

The probability is that Riyází has confounded the earlier Niyází with a poet named Ilyás of Gallipoli who also used the makhlas of Niyází, and who, as ʿAlí, who had seen his Díwán, points out in his notices of the poets of Báyezíd II's time, wrote verses in praise of Sultan Báyezíd the son of Mehemmed (i. e. Báyezíd II).

Belígh, who wrote more than a century later than Riyází, professes to give some particulars concerning Niyází's life; but as he gives no authority for his statements, they can hardly be taken seriously.

Very different is the fate that has attended the labours of Suleymán Chelebi, [1] the other of the two poets who lived under Báyezíd.

This writer, who is called Suleymán-i Burseví, that is, Suleymán the Brusan or native of Brusa, is the earliest strictly Ottoman poet whose work is in our hands. Of his life we have few details; the facts that he was a disciple of the famous teacher Emír Sultán; [2] that he served as Imám or Precentor of the Divan to Báyezíd the Thunderbolt, and that he became, after the death of that monarch, Imám of the great mosque which the latter had built in Brusa, represent the sum of our knowledge concerning his career. [3] The date of his death is unrecorded; but it must have been later than 805 (1403), the year of that of Báyezíd whom we are told he survived.

Suleymán's poem is what is called a Mevlid-i Nebí [4] or Hymn on the Prophet's Nativity. The biographers relate a strange story concerning the circumstances which led to this poem's being written. This story differs somewhat as told by

[1] Often called Suleymán Dede.

[2] Mehemmed Shems-ud-Dín, surnamed Emír Sultán, an illustrious sheykh of the Khalvetí dervish-order, was a native of Bokhárá whence he migrated to Brusa, where he settled and taught. He was greatly esteemed by Báyezíd the Thunderbolt who gave him his daughter in marriage. His death took place in 833 (1429-30); and his tomb, which is in Brusa, is still a favourite place of pilgrimage.

[3] Latífí makes Suleymán the elder brother of the poet ʿAtáʾí; but this, as ʿAlí points out, is probably erroneous, as ʿAtáʾí is spoken of as being a lad in the time of Murád II.

[4] The word Mevlid is often written and pronounced Mevlúd.

Latífí and ᶜAlí. According to the latter authority, whose version seems the more probable, a popular preacher [1] was one day discoursing in Brusa on the text of the Koran which runs, 'We make no difference between any of His apostles.' [2] This he interpreted to mean that all the Prophets were equal in degree; 'Wherefore,' he added, 'I esteem not Muhammed to be more excellent than Jesus — on the twain be peace!' In the excitement produced by this speech — for Muhammed is of course held by orthodox Muslims to be the greatest of the Prophets — Suleymán extemporised this verse: —

Jesus died not, but ascended to the sky, [3]
For that he was of yon Prophet's [4] company. [5]

This couplet so pleased the people that they entreated the poet to undertake a formal panegyric in honour of their great Teacher. Suleymán was prevailed upon, and his famous Birthsong (as we may conveniently render the term Mevlid) is the result.

As told by Latífí, the tale has a more legendary ring. This biographer, who evidently doubted the veracity of his own story — as he deems prudent to wind up with the saving-clause of the Eastern raconteur, 'on the teller be the charge!' —

[1] ᶜAlí and Belígh mention a report that the person in question was a Persian merchant, not a preacher, as Latífí says.

[2] Koran, ii, 285.

[3] According to the common Muhammedan belief, Jesus was not really crucified, someone else (opinions differ as to whom) being miraculously substituted for him at the critical moment, while he himself was carried up to Heaven.

[4] Jesus, as well as the other pre-Muhammedan prophets — Adam, Abraham, Moses, David and the rest of them, — is of course looked upon as Muslim; just as until the advent of Jesus, Judaism represented the True Faith, after which Christianity took its place until Muhammed came. Judaism, Christianity and Islam are thus but stages in the development of one religion.

[5] اولمیوب عیسی کوکه بولدوغی یول * امتندن اولماغیچون ایدی اول

This couplet occurs in Suleymán's poem, near the beginning.

relates that when the preacher had announced his somewhat liberal exposition of the text already quoted, an Arab who happened to be present challenged his interpretation, telling him he knew nothing of the science of exegesis, else he would have known that the verse on which he was so ignorantly commenting signifies merely that in the office of apostleship there are no degrees, since were its application wider, there would be no meaning in that other Koranic verse which says, 'These apostles have We preferred one of them above another.' [1] But the people of Brusa, continues Latífí, sided with their preacher, and heeded not the Arab, who went off to the Arab lands, Egypt and Syria, whence he returned armed with a fetwa or canonical decision granted by the Arab ʿulemá requiring that the offending preacher should either recant or be put to death. But still the Brusans heeded neither him nor his fetwa. Six times did the Arab go between his own country and Brusa bringing with him on each occasion a fresh fetwa to the same effect, but all to no purpose. The seventh fetwa contained a threat that if its requirements were not carried out, the Ottoman dominions would be laid waste (presumably by the Memlúk Sultan of Egypt and Syria). Still the Turks were not to be cowed; so the Arab watched his opportunity, and one day 'he fell upon the preacher before the mosque and slaughtered him as a butcher doth a sheep.' It was while these events were in progress, adds Latífí, that Suleymán composed his Birthsong.

This tale of the Arab, which, by the way, does not seem to have very much to do with Suleymán and his Mevlid, is in all probability apocryphal; yet we can perceive from it the reputation for fanaticism which the Arabs had among

[1] Koran, ii, 254.

the Turks, a reputation for which we shall ere long see a but too true warrant.

The poem which thus came into existence has at all times enjoyed an extraordinary popularity. Many subsequent writers have composed more or less similar hymns on the same subject, but not one of these has ever succeeded in even temporarily ousting this oldest of all from the public favour; and while it still lives on, recited annually in thousands of assemblies over the length and breadth of Turkey, its rivals have one and all passed out of sight and are now practically forgotten. The continued popularity of Suleymán's Birthsong is no doubt attributable in part at least to the fact that it is the first of its class and thus had a start of all the others whereby it was enabled to win its way into the hearts of the people and become indissolubly associated with many hallowed memories before any competitor appeared upon the scene. Its subject too was well calculated to win the public sympathy; for this was not, as with Veled and ʿÁshiq, a transcendental philosophy appealing only to the elect; it was the popular religion, and that in its most popular form. For it is not merely the birth of Muhammed that the poem celebrates, nor even that event treated as a natural occurrence; the Mevlid is really a versified account of the various legends that had grown up round the simple story of the Prophet's life; and thus it spoke directly to that feeling which induces early communities to dwell most lovingly on the supernatural element in the lives of their divinities and saints.

Suleymán's poem [1] is written in mesneví verse in the same metre as Veled's Rebáb-Náme and ʿÁshiq's Gharíb-Náme.

[1] Suleymán's Mevlid-i Nebí does not appear to have been printed, but a few extracts from it are published in the third volume of Ziyá Pasha's Kharábát. An abridged version is contained in the British Museum MS. (Sloane, 3033); and there are in my collection two copies, one apparently complete, the other considerably curtailed.

The style is very simple, without art of any kind. All the same the work has, in great measure on account of this, a picturesque directness; while there is an artless charm in the naïve and childlike fashion in which the poet presents his marvels that is absent from the more laboured and pretentious productions of later years. The language, which is very similar to that of the Gharíb-Náme, we may take to be pure Ottoman Turkish, the dialect of Brusa the ʿOsmánli capital. The book would thus be the oldest specimen of Ottoman Turkish extant and, could we have an early copy, would be of very great philological interest. It is noteworthy as exemplifying the gradual change that was coming over the technique of poetry, that while they still occur from time to time, there are far fewer instances of scansion according to the Turkish system in the Mevlid than in any of the earlier West-Turkish mesnevís: the preponderance of quantitative over syllabic lines is at least as great here as in the lyrics of Burhán-ud-Dín.

Suleymán begins in orthodox fashion with a canto (here called Fasl) to the praise of God, then after a brief prayer to pious readers to repeat the Fátiha [1] on his behalf, he tells how the Light or Essence of Muhammed was the first thing which God created, [2] and how this Light shone upon the brow of Adam and all the subsequent prophets till Muhammed himself, in whose person having found its true home, it will never more appear on earth. This prologue finished, the poet begins the story of the Apostle's nativity, detailing the signs and wonders that heralded the advent

[1] It was a common practice of authors and scribes in old times to pray the reader to repeat the Fátiha or opening chapter of the Koran on their behalf. The Fátiha, which is very short, consisting of only seven verses, occupies in Islam more or less the position that the Lord's Prayer does in Christendom.

[2] See p. 34.

of the last of the Prophets, and the rejoicings of the angels and other citizens of Paradise. Having completed this, his proper theme, he proceeds to give a brief account of the miracles popularly attributed to Muhammed, such as the well-known legend of his splitting the moon in two halves by pointing his finger at it, the fable of his body casting no shadow because it was pure light, and that other of roses growing up wherever his perspiration fell. This is followed by a somewhat more detailed description of the Miʿráj or Ascension of the Prophet, a subject which, like the Nativity itself, was destined to become the theme of many a subsequent writer. This again is succeeded by the story of Muhammed's last illness and death as presented in the legends; after which the poem winds up with a prayer for forgiveness wherein the writer mentions his own name.

It has been for centuries the custom in Turkey to chant portions of Suleymán's Birthsong at the services both public and private which are held on the twelfth of the First Rebíʿ [1] of each year to commemorate the nativity of the Prophet. On that day the Sultan and all his court in gala uniform attend one of the Imperial Mosques at which the state celebration of the festival takes place. [2] There are similar services in other mosques for the benefit of the humbler classes of society. It is reckoned a meritorious act for the well-to-do to give what is called a Mevlúd Jemʿíyeti or 'Birthsong Meeting' in their private houses, to which their friends are invited. These meetings are generally held in the afternoon or the evening; and as it is impossible to have

[1] The First Rebíʿ is the third month of the Muslim lunar year. The date generally given for the birth of Muhammed is the 20th. April, 571.

[2] In former times this ceremony used to be held in the Mosque of Sultan Ahmed. A full account of the ceremonial as it was performed in the eighteenth century will be found in D'Ohsson's admirable 'Tableau Général de l'Empire Othoman.'

them all on the same day, they are held through several weeks following the Prophet's birthday. When a certain verse has been reached in the recitation of the poem a number of servants hand round among the guests sherbet and sweetmeats, the latter contained in small packets shaped something like a sugar-loaf and known as sheker-kulâhi or 'sugar-caps.' [1] The chanters, who are called Mevlid-khʾân or, in more everyday language, Mevludji, are selected on account of their sweetness of voice; and so affecting is the manner in which they recite the old verses that their audience is often moved to tears.

The custom of chanting this poem at those services and meetings is very old; the time of its introduction is not mentioned, but it was in full force when ʿÂshiq Chelebi wrote his Tezkire, and doubtless had been so for long before.

As has been hinted, this custom has in all probability had much to do with the extraordinary and continued popularity of Suleymân's Hymn. To this popularity the pages of all the Ottoman biographers and critics bear ample evidence. Latîfî says that he has looked over nearly a hundred Mevlids, [2] but that not one among them has ever attained the reputation and celebrity of Suleymân's, the only one which might perhaps be worthy to be reckoned as a 'parallel' to it being that by the poet Hamdî. [3] ʿÂshiq too declares that although these many eloquent poets have written Mevlids, not one of them has surpassed this blessed poem or spoiled the market in its bazaar; while every year it is chanted in many and many thousands of assemblies throughout the realms of Islam. ʿÂlî seems deeply impressed by the abiding

[1] These 'sugar-caps' are very like the pointed packets in which small quantities of sugar or tea are sold in this country.

[2] This number must be a gross exaggeration.

[3] Hamdî is a distinguished poet of the fifteenth century whom we shall meet in due course.

success of the Hymn: 'so he (Suleymán Chelebi) made that beloved book whereof the coming from the tongue of the pen to the written page was in a fortunate hour, indeed befell at a time free from the traces of maleficence when the most part of the stars were together in the signs of their exaltation,[1] for that year by year it is read in many thousands of noble assemblies. And indeed he hath versified it in touching notes, for while there are many other hymns on the Nativity, not one of them is taken in hand or brought under the eye; 'tis as though he had written it by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.'[2] Kátib Chelebi has the same story; speaking of Suleymán's Hymn he says, 'and it is this which is recited at the assemblies and gatherings in the Turkish lands: others among the poets have versified the subject, but none is regarded beside it, neither is any other renowned.' In the same strain Belígh declares that as the book has been sealed by the approval of the King of the Prophets, never till the end of time shall the incense of prayer for the blessed soul of the poet cease to rise from the censers of the people's lips when at the annual assemblies of the Faithful is read the verse: —

> Show to Suleymán the hapless of Thy grace, —
> Make the Faith his fere and Heaven his dwelling-place![3]

And, adds the historian, though there are some twenty Mevlids in verse and prose, none is so pathetic and affecting as this, nor has any won the same favour and renown.

Coming down to recent times, we find Ziyá Pasha in the critical introduction which he has prefixed to his great antho-

[1] This imagery is of course taken from astrology.

[2] In Islam the 'Holy Spirit' is a title of the Archangel Gabriel, the medium of Divine revelation, according to the theologians.

[3] ثم سليمان فقيره رحمت ايت * يولداشن ايمان يريني جنت ايت

logy, the Kharábát or 'Tavern,' [1] corroborating to the full the judgment of his predecessors. He speaks of Suleymán as the imám or precentor of the poets of Rúm and the guide of the makers of verse, and says that his sacred poem is warrant enough of his genius. The Pasha confesses his inability to understand what such poetry may be which renders distraught all them that hear it. Although seemingly so artless, love and eloquence meet together in it; from beginning to end it is 'unapproachable simplicity.' [2] During these four hundred years, continues the critic, none of the learned hath said aught to equal it; and although many have striven to 'parallel' it, it still remains 'virgin like the Koran.' [3]

It is easy to understand the enthusiasm of the Turks for this ancient poem which is to them all that our Christmas hymns and carols are to us; but to the foreign student of their literature its chief interest must lie in the fact that it is the earliest extant monument of indubitably Ottoman work.

I have chosen for translation those parts of the Hymn which are usually chanted at the Mevlid Meetings. The first of these, the opening canto of the poem, is an invocation of God whose name it praises. This is followed by a brief supplication to the pious readers and hearers to remember the author in their prayers. Omitting the next canto, which discourses on the 'Light of Muhammed,' we go on to that which describes the birth of the Prophet and the portents that accompanied it; much of this section — which is the

[1] The Kharábát or 'Tavern,' an anthology of Turkish, Persian and Arabic poetry, compiled by Ziyá Pasha, was published in three volumes, in Constantinople, 1291-2 (1874-5).

[2] Sehl-i Mumteni', which I have rendered as 'unapproachable simplicity,' is a common term with Eastern critics to describe an expression which, though apparently simple, is hard to parallel.

[3] It is an axiom that no one ever has produced or ever shall produce a work equal in eloquence to the Koran, — the uncreated Word of God.

kernel of the whole book — is put into the mouth of Ámine, Muhammed's mother. This is followed by a triumphant chorus of greeting to the new-born Prophet, after which there is an omission of many cantos, those describing the miracles and death of Muhammed, till we reach the verses in which the poet bids farewell to the Prophet now gone to his rest. With this, the true end of the poem, the recitations usually close, the epilogue which follows and winds up the book being as a rule omitted.

From the Mevlid-i Nebí or Hymn on the Prophet's Nativity. [36]

First, the name of God the Lord let us declare;
This behoveth every servant every where.
Whosoe'er doth first the name of God recite,
God will make for him his every business light.
Let the name of God begin each business then,
That the end thereof be sorry not and vain. [1]
Let the name of God with every breath be said,
In the name of God be each work finishéd.
If the tongue but once with love God's name do say,
All its sins will fall like autumn leaves away. [2]
Pure becometh he who sayeth His pure name,
Whoso saith God's name attains his every aim.
Let us from our hearts on yon Provider call,

[1] These opening lines paraphrase the Hadís كُلُّ أَمْرٍ ذِى بَالٍ لَمْ يُبْدَأْ بِبِسْمِ ٱللّٰهِ فَهُوَ أَبْتَرُ 'Every work of import that is begun not in the name of God is abortive.'

[2] The simile in this line was perhaps suggested by the story which tells how when once the Prophet was walking with some of his Companions in the autumn he plucked a spray of half-withered leaves which kept falling off as the party proceeded on the road, whereupon Muhammed said, 'The sins of him who repenteth unto God fall from him even as the leaves fall from this spray.'

Yon Creator who from naught hath made us all.
Come ye and on God now let us loveful cry,
Fearful let us weep and let us sadly sigh,
That yon King His mercy fair to us accord,
Yonder Gracious, yonder Ruthful, yonder Lord.
He Omniscient, He the Pardoner of ill,
He the Builder, Placable, Forgiving still,
He the Holy One who all in safety keeps,
He the Lord Eternal who nor dies nor sleeps,
He the King whose reign shall never pass away,
He the Mateless, He the Matchless, Peerless aye.
While as yet the world was not He made it be, [1]
Yet of aught created ne'er a need had He.
He is One, and of His Oneness doubt is none
Though that many err whene'er they speak thereon.
Living He when was nor man nor angel fair,
Heaven nor earth, nor sun nor moon, nor ninefold sphere. [2]
By His power creative all of these He made,
Yea, in these His might and glory He displayed.
Let us ever at His court our needs make known;
He is One, and other god than He is none.
Though such words be said till the Last Day do fall,
Fall might many a Last Day, yet unsaid were all. [3]
So thou seekest from the fire to win thee free,
Say with love and fear: Be blessings unto thee! [4]

Saintly ones, [5] we here begin another speech;

[1] Alluding to the Hadís كَانَ ٱللّٰهُ و لَم يَكُن مَعَهُ شَيءٌ 'God was and there was naught beside Him,' which the orthodox quote against those philosophers who maintain the eternity of matter.

[2] i. e. the Nine Spheres of the Ptolemaic system. See pp. 43-4.

[3] The idea is that the praises of God could not be wholly expressed even in many times the life-time of the world.

[4] At the Mevlud Meetings whenever the chanter recites this couplet, which recurs from time to time, he pauses, when all the assembly say by way of response: Es-salátu we-s-selám ᶜaleyke, yá Resúl-ulláh! es-salátu we-s-selám ᶜaleyke yá Habíb-ulláh! 'Blessing and greeting upon thee, O Apostle of God! Blessing and greeting upon thee, O Beloved of God!' The giving of this response is called salawát getirmek.

[5] Here the readers or hearers are addressed.

Unto you a testament we leave, to each.
Whosoe'er observes the testament I say,
Musk-like in his heart its scent will bide for aye.
May the Lord God give to him His ruth to share, —
Yea, to him who breatheth for my soul a prayer.
He who in this blessing lot and part would have,
Let him say the Fátiha for me his slave.

* * * * * * * * * *

[37]

Lady Amine, Muhammed's mother she,
(From this Shell it was yon Pearl did come to be.)
When Muhammed's time to come was near at hand,
Ere he came were many signs seen through the land.
Now by ᶜAbd-ulláh his sire had she conceived,
And the passing weeks and days the term achieved.
In the night whereon was born that Best of Men [1]
Many a marvel passed before his mother's ken.
On the twelfth 'twas of the First Rebíᶜ it fell,
On a Monday night it tided, wot ye well!
Quoth the mother of that God-belovéd one, [2]
'I beheld a Light whose moth was e'en the sun.
'Sudden from my dwelling flashed the lightning forth,
'Mounted to the skies and lumined all the earth.
'Rank on rank the angels winged from Heaven their way,
'Round my house, as 'twere the Kaᶜba, circled they. [3]
'Quoth they, "Now that Prophet of most high degree
'"Cometh, Master of the Holy House is he!"
'Straightway in the sky was spread a couch full fair,
'Sendal was its name, 'twas angels spread it there.
'Oped the heavens, and the mirk was done away;
'Forth came angels three with flags in bright array;

[1] Khayr-ul-Besher or Khayr-ul-Enám, i. e. 'Best of Mankind,' is a frequent title of Muhammed.

Habíb-ulláh, i. e. 'Beloved of God,' is the special title of Muhammed.

The circumambulation of the Kaᶜba forms an important rite in the Hajj or Mekka-pilgrimage.

'One thereof they planted o'er the East to stream,
'One thereof they planted o'er the West to gleam,
'O'er the Ka'ba planted they the third with awe,
'Passing great the reverence and humblesse I saw.
'When these mighty portents round about me shone,
'Dazed and wildered I abode there all alone.
'Clave the wall, and issuing forth on sudden wise
'Houris three stood visible before my eyes.
'Then from these I knew that Prince of all mankind
'Soon should come his place upon the earth to find.
'Graciously those beauties moon-browed near me drew,
'Straightway greeting me on courteous wise and true;
'With all reverence and grace they greeted me,
'And they spake some words right sweet and courteously.
'And they came and sate them round about me then,
'Wishing one the other joy of him full fain.
'"Never any son like to thy son," said they,
'"Unto earth hath come since the Creation-day;
'"Never any son in glory like to thine
'"Was to mother granted by the Lord Divine.
'"Born of thee this night shall be that Mustafà;[1]
'"Unto all a boon shall be that Mustafà.
'"O thou dear one, thou hast won to mighty bliss;
'"Born of thee shall be the Flower of all that is.
'"All the Saints would yield their lives to meet this night,
'"All the Saints would fain be slaves to greet this night.
'"He who cometh is the King of Heavenly Lore,
'"He who cometh is of Wisdom High the Store.
'"For the love of him who cometh turns the sky;[2]
'"Yearning for his face do men and angels sigh.
'"He who cometh is that King, the Prophets' Seal,[3]

[1] Mustafà i. e. 'Elect,' the second name of the Prophet.

[2] An allusion to the phrase mentioned on page 34: 'But for thee, verily I had not created the heavens!'

[3] 'Seal of the Prophets' is another of Muhammed's special titles, he coming last in the series of the Prophets and confirming his predecessors even as the seal comes at the end of the letter or document and ratifies what goes before.

'"He, that 'Mercy to the Worlds,' [1] Creation's Weal.
'"God the Living, Lord of Glore, hath made decree
'"That this night creation all perfection see;
'"Houris, Bowers, Gardens, yea, all Paradise,
'"All the Garth of Rizwán, [2] shine on glorious wise.
'"There above they celebrate this blessed night,
'"Paradise with gems and jewels have they dight.
'"Houris, Youths of Heaven, [3] and every living thing
'"Fain will scatter gems and jewels o'er that King.
'"Yea, and more, hath God commanded Gabriel:
'"— Make thou fast, O Gabriel, the gates of hell! — [4]
'"For this night the Mercy of the Lord shall be,
'"Past the Awfulness is from His majesty.
'"Ay, this night is e'en the night when through his Light
'"Yonder blessed one shall make earth fair and bright.
'"This the night of yonder King, the Prophet's Seal,
'"Him, the 'Mercy to the worlds,' Creation's Weal.
'"He this night the world as Paradise hath made;
'"God this night to all things hath His Ruth displayed.
'"On this night are birds and beasts and men and jinn, [5]
'"Whate'er is, revealed and hid, each living thing,
'"One and all a-dancing of their joyance fain
'"For that comes the Ruth of God, the Best of Men!"
'In this fashion did they celebrate his praise,
'And the glory of yon Blessed Light upraise.'

Amine saith, 'When was fully come the tide
'When that Best of Men should come on earth to bide,
'Passing sore a thirst came o'er me through the heat,
'Then they gave to me a cup of sherbet sweet;

[1] A quotation from Koran, xxi, 107, where God addressing Muhammed, says, 'We have sent thee only as a mercy to the worlds.'

[2] Rizwán, i. e. Goodwill, is the name of the angel-warden or treasurer of Paradise, see p. 37.

[3] The ghilmán or youths of Paradise, see p. 37.

[4] That none on this blessed night may enter the abode of woe.

[5] The jinn are the 'genii,' the spirits or demons of earth and air, to whom, as well as to mankind, Muhammed's mission was addressed.

'Whiter 'twas than snow, and colder, saintly one,[1]
'Sweetest sugar's sweetness was by it outdone.
'Straight I drank it, all my frame was whelmed in light,
'Nor knew I myself from that effulgence bright;
'When that gleaming Glory had enwrapped me round,
'Heart and soul of me a wondrous joyance found.
'Came a White Bird borne upon his wings straightway
'And with virtue stroked my back as there I lay.[2]
'Then was born the Sultan of the Faith that stound,
'Earth and heaven shone in radious glory drowned.'
So thou seekest from the fire to win thee free,
Say with love and fear: Be-blessings unto thee!

Glad rejoiced creation in delight and mirth,
Grief departed and new life filled all the earth.
Every atom in the world took up the tale,
Cried they all with voices high uplifted: Hail!
Hail to thee! O Sun of fulgent splendour! Hail!
Hail to thee! O Soul of Souls most tender! Hail!
Hail to thee! O Sun of all the Lover-crew!
Hail to thee! O Moon of all the leal and true!
Hail to thee! O Bulbul[3] of E-lestu's mead![4]
All the world is drunken for thy love indeed!
Hail to thee! O Soul that is for ever! Hail!
Hail to thee! Cupbearer of the Lover! Hail!
Hail to thee! O Nightingale of Beauty's bower!
Hail to thee! O Loved One of the Lord of Power!
Hail to thee! O Mercy to the Worlds — to all!
Hail to thee! O Pleader for the folk who fall!
Hail to thee! O Refuge of the rebel race!
Hail to thee! O Helper of the portionless!
Hail to thee! O King of Glore! All hail to thee!

[1] This 'saintly one' is an address to the reader, awkwardly enough introduced here.

[2] It is when this couplet has been reached at the Mevlid Meetings that the sherbet and sweets are brought in and handed round; these are presented first to the chanter, then to the assembled guests.

[3] The Bulbul is the Nightingale.

[4] For the meaning of E-lestu see pp. 22-3.

Hail to thee! O Mine of Lore! All hail to thee!
Hail to thee! Epiphany of God most Grand!
Hail to thee! O Leader of the Prophet-band!
Hail to thee! Unsetting Sun! All hail to thee!
Hail to thee! Unwaning Moon! All hail to thee!
Hail to thee! O Parrot of the world's herbere!
Wildered for thy love doth every soul appear!
Hail to thee! O Secret of the Scripture! Hail!
Hail to thee! O Balm for every dolour! Hail!
Hail to thee! O Coolth o' th' eyne![1] O Intimate![2]
Hail to thee! O Most Beloved of God the Great!
Hail to thee! O Moon! O Sun of God, most fair!
Hail to thee! who from the Lord art parted ne'er!
Hail to thee! of all the fond Desire art thou!
Hail to thee! to God most near and dear art thou!
Hail to thee! O thou of Either World the King!
Yea, for thee this universe to life did spring![3]
Thou art of Apostleship's high Throne the Seal!
Thou art of the Prophetship's bright Sun the Seal!
Thou whose day-like visage is the plenilune!
Thou who reachest hand to all the fallen down!
Even as thy Light hath all the world illumed,
Through thy rose-face hath the world a garden bloomed!
Lo, thou art the Sovran of the Prophet-host!
Light of eye to all the saints and all the just!
'Neath thy word is all the World of Spirit laid!
In thy field the man of Love hath staked his head![4]
So thou seekest from the fire to win thee free,
Say with love and fear: Be blessings unto thee!

* * * * * * * * * *

[38]

Fare thee well! O Soul most tender! Fare thee well!
Fare thee well! O Moon of splendour! Fare thee well!

[1] Qurret-ul-'Ayn, 'Coolth o' th' eyne,' is a favourite term of endearment.
[2] i. e. Intimate of God.
[3] Another allusion to God's address to the Light of Muhammed.
[4] i. e. the Man of Love, the 'Lover,' is ready to die for thee.

Fare thee well! O Sovran of the Lover-band!
Fare thee well! O Lord! O King of every land!
Fare thee well! O Nightingale of Beauty's bower!
Fare thee well! O Loved One of the Lord of Power!
Fare thee well! O Union Pearl of lustre bright!
Fare thee well! O Motive of the Glorious Light!
Fare thee well! O Sovereign! O Monarch mine!
Fare thee well! O Balm for every pain and pine!
By you all from Mustafà be warning ta'en!
Ne'er an one of us, by God, shall here remain.
Howsoever long may any's life aby,
At the end this surely is his work — to die.
Come then, and for death prepare, be ready dight,
That your faces in the Presence there be white.
From thy hand, O Death, alack! ah, woe is me!
Neither king nor beggar e'er may win him free.
Woe is me, from yonder Prophet parted far!
Woe is me, for yonder Leader yearning sore!
Unto all of them who happy be and wise
Death for preacher and for counsel doth suffice.
So thou seekest from the fire to win thee free,
Say with love and fear: Be blessings unto thee!

CHAPTER IV.

Riveting the Yoke.

Prince Suleymán's Poets. Ahmed-i Dá'í.

During the ninety years that elapsed between the time when 'Osmán found himself independent and the accession of his great-grandson Báyezíd I — him whom the Turks call Yildirim Báyezíd or Báyezíd the Thunderbolt, — the Ottoman Kingdom had grown considerably. Not only had extensive territories been acquired in Europe, but in Asia many and important districts had been wrested from the Byzantines, and two out of the nine other Kingdoms of the West-Turkish Decarchy had been absorbed. Of these two, Qarasi was the first to disappear, it having been annexed by Orkhan in 737 (1336-7); the other, Hamíd, was purchased by Murád I in 783 (1381-2).

Báyezíd the Thunderbolt lost no time; in 792 (1390), the very year of his accession, he annexed other five of those little states, Aydin, Saru-Khan, Menteshe, Germiyan and Tekke, in a single campaign. The remaining two, Qaraman and Qizil-Ahmedli, soon followed; and thus, despite the temporary set-back caused by Timur's invasion, the West-Turkish Empire was re-established. In 800 (1398) a further step was taken; the districts of Siwas, Qaysaríya, Toqat and Erzinjan, which had formed the little kingdom of Cadi

Burhán-ud-Dín, were incorporated; and on the east and south-east the Ottoman frontiers marched with the territories of the newly sprung-up Turkman dynasties of the Black Sheep and of the White Sheep, of the Zu-l-Qadr and the Beni-Ramazán.

The work of building up the West-Turkish Empire was thus in full progress when the invasion of Timur, culminating in 804 (1402) in the Battle of Angora with the defeat and capture of Báyezíd and the seeming annihilation of the Ottoman power, threw everything in Western Asia into momentary chaos and retarded for a brief period the development of Turkey. The dethroned kinglets of the seven little Turkish states annexed by the Thunderbolt re-entered into more or less short-lived possession of their own, while the Ottoman princes, Suleymán, ʿIsa, Músa and Mehemmed, fought furiously with one another for what was left of their father's empire. For eleven years the fratricidal conflict raged, till in 816 (1413) Prince Mehemmed, thenceforward Sultan Mehemmed I — Chelebi Sultán Mehemmed or Sultan Mehemmed the Debonair, as his people loved to call him, — found himself sole survivor of the four brothers and undisputed sovereign of the Ottoman state. The empire to which Mehemmed thus succeeded did not materially differ in extent from that which his father had inherited quarter of a century before. The seven little kingdoms indeed were gone, but except for their loss the Ottoman frontiers were practically unchanged.

Timur's dash into Asia Minor was no true conquest of the country; it was but a raid on a grand scale; he harried Anatolia from end to end, and then departed to return no more. And so the confusion which followed was only superficial, no vital change was wrought; all that happened was a certain delay in the consolidation of the West-Turkish power.

But though the development of the Turkish empire was thus arrested for a moment, the development of Turkish poetry proceeded without check or pause. In the work produced about the time of the Tartar onslaught we find no trace of that uncertainty as to course, that halting between two opposing principles, which in greater degree or less has marked all the verse written up till now. From this time West-Turkish poetry formally renounces every exclusively Turkish characteristic; these Turkish verse-forms which happened to be duplicated in the Persian system are retained, but the old syllabic prosody passes altogether away from literary verse, not to re-appear till the rise of the Modern School in our own day. The victory now obtained by the Persian poetic system is complete; not only is every detail of this accepted and made into an integral part of the Ottoman, but whatever is unrepresented there is resolutely refused admittance, or if it happened to be present, is ruthlessly cast out.

Along with this development appears another phenomenon. Before the invasion of Timur poets had been few in Rúm — we have not been able to find a dozen in the course of a hundred years — after that event they arise on every side.

One cannot but ask how it is that these things, the final self-adjustment of Turkish poetry to its foreign model and the sudden increase in the number of its practitioners, should have occurred at the very moment when the Power which represented the nascent nationality of the Western Turks was reeling under the rudest blow ever dealt it in all its long history.

ʿAlí suggests as an answer to this question the influence of certain Persian men of letters who accompanied Timur on his campaign in Asia Minor. Like many another Oriental prince, the Tartar conqueror was fond of the society of

poets and men of learning, and numerous stories are on record concerning his interviews with the learned men of Rúm and of the good-humoured way in which he received their sometimes not very courtier-like sallies. These Turkish scholars would doubtless discuss their craft with the erudite Persians in Timur's suite, and in the course of conversation get many a hint that would profit them in their further work. Such friendly intercourse between the followers of an invader and the people of an invaded country may appear strange to a modern European; but there was nothing unusual in it. In those days nationality and patriotism, as we conceive them, existed not in the East. Wars were waged under the impulse of religious enthusiasm, or from sheer greed of plunder, or the mere love of fighting, or else, as in this instance, through the ambition of princes. Except in the first case, nothing like personal animosity existed between the individual combatants; and when they were not actually engaged in fighting, they were ready enough to meet on friendly terms.

But though the impulse given to Ottoman letters by such intercourse with accomplished Persians no doubt goes for something, it seems hardly a sufficient explanation of the efflorescence of full-blown literary poetry at this particular juncture. Another partial explanation may perhaps be found in the encouragement given to letters, and especially to poetry, by Prince Suleymán, the eldest son of the Thunderbolt, and for a time the most successful of the competitors for the throne. The court which this gallant but reckless Prince held at Adrianople was, while it lasted, the centre of Ottoman culture, and under the genial influence of his appreciative patronage poetry was fostered as it had never been before.

But it seems to me that the true answer to the question lies in the simple fact that the time was now ripe for the

development that took place. That this synchronised with the Tartar invasion was a mere accident; it would have been accomplished all the same had Timur never crossed the frontier. We have seen how the distinctively Turkish element was becoming ever less and less as poet succeeded poet. There was very little trace of the syllabic prosody in Suleymán's Hymn; the next step would naturally be to omit it altogether. Again, we are told that Niyází, who wrote before the invasion, had exactly reproduced the Persian lyric style in his Turkish verses, and the scraps of these that we have go to confirm the statement. [1]

Niyází, moreover, did not stand alone; the poets Ahmed-i Dá'í, Ahmedí and Nesímí were all contemporary with him; and although much of the work of these three was doubtless produced after the Tartar raid, they were (with the possible exception of Dá'í of whom we know little) certainly writing before that catastrophe, and most probably during the lifetime of Niyází. [2] The complete Díwáns of Ahmedí and Nesímí are in our possession, and in these we find the Persian system completely accepted and alone recognised. As it is unlikely either that these poets rewrote their early lyrics in later life or that their editors would omit their earlier works when compiling their Díwáns, I am inclined to believe that the

[1] Niyází is the first Turkish poet to follow the universal Persian practice of using a Makhlas or Pen-name. Previous and contemporary writers had been content with their personal name or their surname; but 'Niyází' is neither a personal name nor a surname, but a pen-name, and one, moreover, that has been adopted by several subsequent Ottoman poets. To choose such and write under it was, of course, an essential part of the programme of an author whose aim was the naturalisation of every Persian literary usage. The practice at once became universal, and from this time forth the poets who wrote under their personal name are in a microscopic minority.

[2] The first draft at any rate of Ahmedí's Iskender-Náme was finished in 792 (1390). Some of Nesímí's verses are said to have been recited in the presence of Fazl-ulláh the Hurúfí who was put to death by Timur in 804 (1401-2).

complete ascendency of the Persian system was practically established shortly before Timur's invasion, and so was not, as ʿÁlí would infer, a result of that event.

The increase in the number of poets at this point may be accounted for by the general advance in culture made by the Turkish people since the chaos brought about by the Mongol invasion and the Seljúq collapse. Especially during the reign of Báyezíd was this advance remarkable. Under that monarch Brusa became a centre of learning; and although this for the most part took the direction of scholastic theology, the science which above all others stood emphatically for 'learning' in medieval Islam, it prepared the ground for a wider and more liberal culture.

For eight years after the Battle of Angora Prince Suleymán reigned as an independent sovereign over the Ottoman territories in Europe. During this time his court at Adrianople was, as we have said, the centre of West-Turkish culture. That it was so in a truer sense than Brusa had yet been was owing to the Prince's possessing a taste for literature, and especially for poetry, such as none of his fathers had ever displayed. He loved to surround himself with poets; and it was chiefly from their ranks that he chose his boon-companions for the wild carouses in which he delighted. For unhappily for himself, this Prince's devotion to every form of pleasure was at least as strong as his love of poetry. His unbridled debauchery lost for him the respect of his soldiers and his people; so that at last in the hour of need his army deserted and left him to perish miserably at the hands of his rivals. 814 (1411).

ʿAshiq and ʿAlí give us the names of some of the poets whom Suleymán gathered around him at Adrianople. Prominent among these are the brothers Ahmedí and Hamzeví. Ahmedí, the author of the earliest extant Ottoman romantic poem, is so notable a figure that we leave him and his work to be dealt with at some length in the next chapter. His brother Hamzeví is chiefly remarkable for having collected in twenty-four volumes the legendary history of Hamza the uncle of the Prophet. This work was in prose freely interspersed with verses; and it was by reason of it that the author adopted his makhlas of Hamzeví. [1]

[1] 'Hamzeví' is an adjectival form of Hamza; 'Hamzan' we might say. Von

Another of the circle was Sheykh-oghli, of whom ᶜAshiq tells us that he wrote a poem called Ferrukh-Náme or 'The Book of Ferrukh' (the name of the hero)[1] from which this couplet is quoted: —

> So came from hand what comes from heart,[2] 'twould e'en be
> That every beggar would a king or queen be.[3]

More important than either Hamzeví or Sheykh-oghli — at least so the biographers must have deemed him as they accord him alone of the three an entry all to himself — is the poet Ahmed-i Dáᶜí. Latífí, Hasan Chelebi and ᶜAlí agree in making this writer a native of Germiyan, in which petty kingdom, according to the last-mentioned, he had been a cadi or judge.[4] In due time, however, he found his way to Adrianople, where he was received into high favour by Prince Suleymán.[5]

He wrote a good deal for his Ottoman patron including a poem called Jenk-Náme or 'The Book of War,'[6] which seems to have been a versified history of the struggle between

Hammer, I know not on what authority, gives 815 (1412) as the date of Hamzeví's death.

[1] ᶜAlí is mistaken in saying that ᶜAshiq attributes the Ferrukh-Náme to Ahmed-i Dáᶜí. Kátib Chelebi describes this book as 'a Turkish poem by Sheykh-záde in the reign of Sultan Yildirim Khan.' In the printed edition of ᶜAlí and in Fluegel's Kátib Chelebi the name of the work is given as فرح نامه Ferah-Náme (which would mean 'The Book of Gladness'), an obvious slip for فرخ نامه Ferrukh-Náme, as will appear from what is said in Chapter IX. Sheykh-oghli and Sheykh-záde are the same name, the first being the Turkish, the second the Persian form for 'Sheykh-son.'

[2] i. e. could the hand carry out the heart's desires.

[3] اکر دلدن کلن الدن کلیدی * کدالر قالمیوب سلطان اولیدی

[4] It must be by a slip that Von Hammer makes Dáᶜí a native of Qaraman.

[5] Von Hammer, without indicating his authority, gives 815 (1412) as the date of Dáᶜí's death.

[6] Von Hammer, following Latífí, reads Chenk-Náme or 'The Book of the Harp;' but Hasan Chelebi and Kátib Chelebi read Jenk-Náme. ᶜAlí confuses Dáᶜí's poem with Sheykh-oghli's, calling the former Ferah-Náme, while he says it contains much brilliant battle imagery.

Suleymán and his brothers.[1] Another of his works was a treatise on the branch of polite learning that is called ʿIlm-i Teressul. This consists in the knowledge of the rules of courtesy that must be observed in correspondence, rules which determine with great nicety the manner in which a person should be addressed according to his social station, and the ways in which different subjects should be presented. When Hasan and ʿAlí wrote, this treatise of Dáʿí's was widely known among the people. In some manuscripts and in the printed edition of Latífí it is said that Ahmed-i Dáʿí wrote further a work dealing with Persian and Arabic lexicography, which he called ʿUqúd-ul-Jewáhir or 'The Strings of Gems.'

According to Von Hammer, Sehí Bey, the earliest biographer of poets — he wrote but a few years before Latífí, — says that in his time Dáʿí's Díwán was known everywhere, copies being very common in both Rumelia and Anatolia. Such may very well have been the case three centuries and a half ago, but copies are sufficiently rare nowadays; at least I have failed to discover any, and so must rest content with repeating Latífí's somewhat superfluous remark that the ghazels are in an 'antiquated' style. Latífí and Hasan quote this couplet, than which, they both declare, there is nothing better in the whole Díwán: —

By Tá Há's chapter,[2] O mine eye, I charge thee speak, didst e'er thou see
A worry like my Dear, a frenzied Lover like this heart of me?[3]

[1] Fluegel's edition of Kátib Chelebi thus describes the Jenk-Náme: 'In Turkish, by the poet Ahmed of Germiyan and the poet Dervísh, concerning the war of Sultan Selím with his brother Báyezíd.' This last phrase obviously should read 'the war of Sultan (i. e. Prince) Suleymán with his brothers the sons of Báyezíd.' Sultan Selím I had no brother named Báyezíd, while Sultan Selím II was never engaged in war with a brother. Who the 'poet Dervísh' is, or what Kátib Chelebi means by making him joint author of the Jenk-Náme, I do not know.

[2] The twentieth chapter of the Koran is called the Chapter of Tá Há,

ʿAlí, though he cites the above, prefers the following ghazel, which he says he takes from Sehí Bey. In this ghazel, the first three couplets of which are quoted also by Latífí and Hasan, the Persian influence now supreme in poetry appears in fullest flower. The rhyming is already intricate to a degree beyond which no later master of the craft ever pushed. Here, in this little poem whence every vestige of spontaneity is banished and where artificiality is all in all, we see forged to the last link those alien fetters which are for ages to trammel and repress the genius of Turkey.

these being the Arabic names of the two letters T H which are prefixed to it.

3 کوزم هیچ کوردیکك وارمی بحق سورهٔ طه
بنم یارم کبی فتنه بنم کوکلم کبی شیدا

In the printed edition of Latífí there is the following comment on this couplet: 'The foregoing couplet was highly esteemed of Dáʿí, and is the most approved artistic distich in his Díwán. But it is remarkable that with all his skill and knowledge he should have overlooked the amphibological sense of his words and should not have perceived of how many meanings his language is susceptible. For he saith in the second line of the above distich, Yárim gibi fitne, 'a worry like my Dear.' The word fitne 'worry' is in this place a curious expression, amphibologic, implying censure, and suggesting a coarse word. In the common speech of the people they apply fitne 'worry' to a certain small dog, a kind of cur. The poets of the age generally use this word when speaking of the rival, as in this couplet: —

رقیبه صدر کوستردك دیدك اول فتنه‌یه اولو
بنم بر ایت قدر واه واه قپوکده اعتبارم یوق

Thou'st shown the rival the chief seat, and to yon worry, { 'Bey!' / 'Bay!' } hast said.
Alack! alack! I am not held e'en as a dog before thy gate!'

[In this verse the word اولو, addressed by the sweetheart to the rival, has two meanings, 'great' and 'howl:' an attempt has been made to preserve the equivoque in the translation, by the hononyms Bey (title) and Bay (bark).

The word fitne may have been popularly applied to a dog in Latífí's time, but I have seen no allusion to such a use elsewhere, and it is unknown in the present day.]

Ghazel. [1] [39]

O Lunar-fashioned Sun of light! [2] thy face is Jovial in sight! [3]
What light? The Ascendant light. And what ascendant? The ascendant bright.

By thy fair face ashine is earth, and by thy life the time 's a garth!
What garth? The garth of Heaven on high. What Heaven? The Heaven of Kevser's site. [4]

Thy face it is the Verse of Ruth, thy self it is of Power the Proof!
What Power? The Maker's Power forsooth. What maker? The Maker of Might.

As Solomon's the story thine, as Alexander's glory thine!
What glory? Joseph's glory sheen. [5] What Joseph? Joseph lord of right.

The chesner Sphere [6] thou hast outdone; the realm of fortune thou hast won!
What realm? The realm of luck. What luck? The luck of him who 's Cæsar [7] hight.

Untold the slaves about thy stead; the meanest is thy slave Ahmed!
What Ahmed? Ahmed the Dá'í. [8] What Dá'í? Dá'í servant-wight.

[1] This ghazel is evidently addressed to Prince Suleymán.

[2] The Sun that combines the beauty of the Moon with his own radiance is the Prince.

[3] Jupiter was reckoned by the astrologers the most auspicious of the planets.

[4] Kevser is the name of one of the rivers of Paradise, see p. 36.

[5] Joseph, as we shall see again and again, is the constant type of youthful beauty with the Muslim poets.

[6] The Sphere, conceived as an evil power whose delight is to thwart and baffle man (see p. 44, n. 3.), is constantly personified by the poets, sometimes under a male, sometimes under a female form. In the present instance it is represented as a chess-player intent on checkmating the Prince, who none the less has beaten it and won the prize fortune.

[7] Qaysar i. e. 'Cæsar,' is the special title of the Emperor of Constantinople, be he Byzantine or Ottoman.

[8] The word dá'í, which this poet Ahmed adopted as his makhlas, means 'one who prays for another,' a 'bedesman.'

CHAPTER V.

THE ROMANCISTS.

Ahmedí.

The earliest romancist among the Western Turks was probably that Ahmed whose poem Canopus and Vere was, according to ᶜAshiq Chelebi, written in the days of Murád I. But as nothing is known of that author or his work save from the brief and contemptuous passage in ᶜAshiq's Tezkire, Táj-ud-Dín Ahmed, better known under his makhlas of Ahmedí, the brother of Hamzeví and the panegyrist of Prince Suleymán, is to all intents and purposes the introducer of the metrical romance.

There is the usual uncertainty as to Ahmedí's birthplace; Latífí and ᶜAlí make him a native of Siwas, but Tash-köprizáde, whose notice of this poet appears more reliable than Latífí's, says that he and his brother were born in the little kingdom of Germiyan. While yet quite young he left his native land in order to prosecute his studies in Cairo, then the metropolis of Arab culture; and when there he foregathered with two other young Turks, Hajji Pasha[1] and

[1] Hajji Pasha was a native of the petty kingdom of Aydin. After studying and writing a good deal on scholastic subjects, he turned his attention to medicine in consequence of an illness which he had contracted. He acquired so great a name in this science that he was appointed governor of the hospital in Cairo. He wrote in Arabic a famous medical treatise called Shifá-

Fenárí,[1] who had gone thither on the same errand as himself, and who both were destined to become illustrious in the learned world of their day: Tash-köpri-záde tells us, and the story is repeated, more or less slightly modified, by all the subsequent biographers, that the three friends, who were then studying under the famous teacher Sheykh Ekmel-ud-Dín, being anxious to learn something of the fortune that awaited them, repaired one day to the cell of a certain professor of the occult arts who had a high reputation as a reader of the future. This gifted personage 'looked into the mirror of their auspicious destiny,' and turning to Hajji Pasha, said, 'Thou shalt busy thyself with medicine;' then to Fenárí, 'Kindling thee at the light of learning, thou shalt shine, and from thee shall many light the lamp, many stir the fire of guidance on the way of salvation;' and lastly to Ahmedí, 'Thou shalt waste thy time over poetry; and neglecting the universal sciences, thou shalt turn thee to the particular arts;'[2] all of which prophecies of course duly came to pass.

From Cairo Ahmedí returned to his native country of

ul-Esqám ve Dewá-ul-Álám or 'The Healing of Ills and the Cure of Pains,' and in Turkish a smaller work on the same subject which he named Teshíl-ut-Tibb or 'The Facilitation of Medicine.'

[1] Mevláná Shems-ud-Dín Mehemmed-i Fenárí was among the most distinguished of the early Ottoman ʿulemá. He was born in 751 (1350) at a village called Fenár, whence his surname. During the reigns of Báyezíd and Mehemmed he enjoyed great reputation as a teacher in Brusa, students coming from all parts to attend his lectures. In 828 (1425) Murád II made him Cadi of Brusa. In 833 (1430) he undertook for the second time the pilgrimage to Mekka, on this occasion as an act of thanksgiving for the recovery of his sight which he had temporarily lost. He died in 834 (1431). He left several works in Arabic on scholastic subjects.

[2] By the term 'universal sciences' (ʿulúm-i kullíye) is meant the abstract sciences, such as metaphysic; these, being the peculiar province of the Soul Reasonable, were accounted more worthy of respect than the 'particular arts' (funún-i juzʾíye), like prosody and rhetoric, which depend upon such faculties of the Soul Sensible as observation and imagination. See pp. 48-51.

Germiyan where he became khoja or titular tutor to the Emír or King who, we are told, being fond of poetry, held his preceptor in high esteem. This was most probably during the reign of the Ottoman Sultan Murád I; in any case it must have been before 792 (1390), the year in which Báyezíd the Thunderbolt swept away the independence of Germiyan and of so many other of the states of the Decarchy.

The next glimpse we get of Ahmedí is at Amasiya where he is said to have presented a qasída to Timur who had paused at that city while on his devastating march through the Turkish lands. The poem, we are told, greatly pleased the Tartar king who bade the author join his private circle, where his wit and conversational gifts found much favour. Here again the author of the Crimson Peony tells a story which is reproduced without substantial difference by his successors. One day Timur invited Ahmedí to accompany him to the private bath in the establishment which served him as a palace, and when there he asked him by way of pleasantry to set a value on each of the young beauties who were in attendance to perform the various offices connected with the Eastern bath. So the poet began and valued one at the 'tribute of Egypt;' [1] another at the world full of silver and gold, and so on. When he had finished, Timur said, 'Come now, value me likewise.' Ahmedí looked at the great conqueror, the master of half Asia, and answered, 'Eighty aspers.' [2] 'Out on thee, Ahmedí!' said the King,

[1] 'The tribute of Egypt,' a phrase used to express any immense sum of money.

[2] The Ottoman coinage was inaugurated by Sultan Orkhan who in 729 (1329) issued small silver pieces which were originally called aqcha-i ʿosmání. Until the end of the reign of Selím I (the first quarter of the sixteenth century) these little coins were usually called simply ʿosmání; from that time onwards the common designation has been aqcha. English writers have almost always used the word 'asper' to represent the Turkish aqcha; and as the former term, though incorrect, has found its way into our dictionaries

'how is it thou thus judgest? the towel [1] alone which is about my middle is worth eighty aspers.' 'It is even the towel about thy middle that I valued,' rejoined the poet, 'that apart, thou art not worth a brass farthing!' Timur had the magnanimity not only to pardon Ahmedí, but to present him with such valuables as he had with him at the bath. Perhaps, if there is any truth in the story, the despot admired the courage which dared thus address him.

Some time after this, Ahmedí attached himself to the court of Prince Suleymán at Adrianople, where he was well received. According to the Crimson Peony he presented to this Prince his great poem the Iskender-Náme or 'Book of Alexander' which had been written several years earlier, but to which he continued to add almost to the time of his death; he also wrote for him a great number of qasídas and ghazels which were formed into a Díwán. He returned to Amasiya, probably on the death of his patron, and there, according to Tash-köpri-záde, he died about the end of the year 815 (Jan.—Feb. 1413). The same authority states that Ahmedí was over eighty years of age at the time of his death; if this is correct, he must have been upwards of seventy when at Suleymán's court.

Latífí's account of Ahmedí, which has been followed by Von Hammer, differs considerably from the foregoing. Accord-

and may be considered as the English representative of the original, I shall make use of it in the present work. Authorities differ as to the exact value of the original aqcha or asper; but it is agreed that the coin was pretty nearly equivalent to the modern ghurush or piastre, that is, to about $2^1/_2$ d. of our money. This value was fairly maintained till the time of Mehemmed II [855 (1451) — 918 (1481)] when it fell to about 2d. After this the asper continued steadily to decline. The last struck were issued by Mahmúd II in 1234 (1818-9). For an excellent and detailed account of the Ottoman coinage, see Ghálib Edhem Bey's Taqwím-i Meskúkát-i ᶜOsmáníya.

[1] The towel or napkin which the bather puts round his waist and which reaches to the knees or a little lower.

ing to this biographer, the poet, who was a native of Siwas, was the panegyrist of one Mír (Lord) Selmán or Sulmán, a tribal chief of Murád I's time, for whom he wrote his Iskender-Náme and his Díwán. The prince here meant is probably the King of Germiyan to whom, according to the Crimson Peony, Ahmedí acted as khoja. There is, however, generally considerable difficulty in individualising the rulers of these little states of the Decarchy, as the Ottoman historians, who are our chief authorities, have an unfortunate habit of speaking of those kinglets by a simple patronymic such as Germiyan-oghli, 'the Son of Germiyan,' without mentioning the name of the descendant in question. That Latífí's Mír Sulmán was the King of Germiyan is the opinion of the modern Ottoman scholar Fá'iq Reshád Bey. This opinion receives some support from the fact that, as we shall learn more fully in a later chapter, the contemporary poet Sheykh-oghli began his romantic mesneví when 'Sháh Suleymán was King of all Germiyan,' although this sovereign appears to have died before the completion of the poem, which was eventually presented to Báyezíd Bey (Sultan Báyezíd the Thunderbolt). On the other hand, no mention of a king of Germiyan called Suleymán has been found in the histories. These tell us that in 783 (1381-2) Prince (afterwards Sultan) Báyezíd married the daughter of the Germiyan-oghli of the time, then an aged man, whose son Ya'qúb Bey (the name in this case is recorded) was ruler of the country when it was annexed by the Ottomans some nine years later. The Germiyan-oghli who was Báyezíd's father-in-law may be the Mír Sulmán or Sháh Suleymán of the poets.

Latífí says nothing about the sojourn in Egypt, nothing about the intercourse with Timur, but on the other hand he tells a story concerning the Iskender-Náme which, though repeated by Hasan Chelebi, is passed over by all the other

biographers. It is to the effect that when Ahmedí presented this poem to 'the magnates of the age,' — by which term must be meant Mír Sulmán and his courtiers, — these declined to accept it, saying, 'A deft qasída had been better than such a book as this.' Deeply chagrined by such a reception, the author went back to the house which he shared with Sheykhí, afterwards so illustrious as a poet, and there told his friend the cause of his dejection. That night Sheykhí composed an elegant qasída which he gave to Ahmedí telling him to offer it on the morrow to his dissatisfied patrons. Ahmedí did so, when the patrons, who seem to have had some idea of criticism, having glanced over the lines, said to him, 'If this qasída be thine, yon book is not; and if the book be, this qasída is not.'

Such is Latífí's story, and it need not be without foundation. The Iskender-Náme contains no dedication; the question is therefore between the statements of the biographers. Latífí, the earliest authority, says it was presented to the 'tribal chief' Mír Sulmán (presumably the King of Germiyan); Tash-köpri-záde says it was presented to Prince Suleymán the son of Báyezíd; ʿAshiq, Hasan and ʿAlí are silent on the subject. The identity of name between the two princes has probably bred confusion; but it may be that the first draft of the work was offered to the King of Germiyan and rejected as Latífí tells, and that later on a more perfect version was presented to and accepted by Prince Suleymán.

With regard to the part attributed to Sheykhí; we know from the Crimson Peony that in his youth this poet, who was likewise a Germiyan Turk, was a pupil of Ahmedí's, so is it not improbable that they may at one time have lived under the same roof. Sheykhí's skill in decorative verse was certainly far beyond Ahmedí's; but whether the elder

poet would have condescended to pass off a pupil's work as his own may fairly be questioned.

Ahmedí's great work the Iskender-Náme or 'Book of Alexander'[1] is what in early French literature would be called an Alexandréide, that is a history of Alexander the Great as this was understood by the medieval world. It is the first important secular poem of the Western Turks, if indeed we may describe as secular a book which though dealing with a legendary story and touching upon all branches of the knowledge of the day, takes each incident as it arises for the text for a sermon and discovers in every scene an allegory or a parable. For this poem is not merely one of the many fabulous versions of the life of the great conqueror which in the Middle Ages sprang up on all sides both in East and West; here the story of Alexander is so to speak but the frame-work within which the author sought to enclose an epitome of all the science, whether sacred or secular, of his time. His aim was thus to make of his book a kind of encyclopædia embracing in abstract all human knowledge.

For this purpose the story of Alexander was well chosen; for the King being represented as of an inquiring turn of mind and being ever accompanied by his sages, Aristotle, Plato and the rest of them, the machinery for a formidable scientific discussion is always at hand. In this way Ahmedí contrives to introduce not merely abstracts of psychology and medicine, astronomy and geography, and the other sciences of the time, but a summary of the whole field of history as the medieval East knew it. This summary, which occupies about a fourth of the entire poem, finishes in some

[1] Ahmedí's Iskender-Náme is still unpublished. The British Museum has five MSS. (Harl. 3273: Add. 7918: Add. 7905: Or. 1376: Add. 5986.) of which only the first is complete. There is an imperfect copy in my collection.

manuscripts with the fall of the Baghdad Khalifate, while in others it is carried down to the author's own time, winding up with the reign of his patron Suleymán over European Turkey.

But such discourses on science or history, which are always put into the mouth of some sage or other and thus woven into the story, are not the only interruptions to which this is subjected. After every incident in the narrative Ahmedí stops and, speaking in his own person, draws a moral from what he has just related, the incident itself being most often turned into an allegory; and thus he makes his book a manual of Practical Philosophy as well as of Theoretic.

When Ahmedí wrote, Turkish literature was, as we know, extremely limited, consisting almost entirely of a few mystic poems; it may have been his ambition to supply a complete library in one great work and to present to his countrymen in their own language the essentials of an education hitherto accessible only to those versed in Arabic and Persian. But whatever may have been the motive of the author, it is beyond question that while his book gains in interest from an archæological point of view by what is practically a panorama of Oriental science in the fourteenth century, the continually recurring interruptions and long-winded digressions are fatal to the poem as a work of art. But then we have no reason to think that Ahmedí ever regarded the Iskender-Náme as a work of art; his obvious purpose was to educate and to supply a guide for conduct. That he chose to write in verse may well have been simply because verse was the easiest and most natural medium of literary expression in the existing condition of the Turkish language. He makes no attempt to embellish his lines with any kind of rhetorical ornament; even the homonym, which the single-minded ʿAshiq did not disdain, is disregarded. Picturesqueness of

imagery is equally little sought after; the result being a style of extreme simplicity often degenerating into baldness. Here and there this simplicity of thought and language lends a certain vigour to the verse, and would do so more often but for the intolerable prolixity which is the besetting sin of Ahmedí as it is of the whole family of medieval romancists.

The Iskender-Náme was written during the latter half of the fourteenth century, somewhat before the definite settlement of prosody. None the less, the metre employed, which is the same as that used by Veled, ᶜAshiq and Suleymán, is fairly correctly observed, the chief irregularity being an inordinate use of elision. From the first the poets had occasionally, as a prosodial license, elided a short vowel immediately followed by a long one; this license Ahmedí turned into a practice. The result is displeasing, and must have been at once felt to be so, as no subsequent poet availed himself of this license to anything like the same extent, and eventually the use of elision was dropped altogether.

As might be expected, the old Ottoman critics, Latífí, ᶜAshiq, Hasan and ᶜAlí, are at one in disparaging the manner of the Iskender-Náme. So artless a poem could hardly commend itself to those masters of the 'grand style.' Latífí declares that the literary skill of Ahmedí is in no wise commensurate with his learning; Hasan says that though his Iskender-Náme is renowned, the manner of its versification is notorious; ᶜAlí sees in 'his diffuse and prolix mesneví' and in 'his insipid and awkward phrases' a fulfilment of the prophecy of the Egyptian seer who foretold that he would 'waste his time' over versifiying.

Ahmedí's poem is not, like many Turkish romances, a translation from the Persian. It has little beyond the name and the general subject in common with Nizámí's celebrated

poems. The story as given by Ahmedí follows generally on the lines of the history of Alexander as this is detailed in the Sháh-Náme of Firdausí. But the Turkish poet frequently modifies, sometimes quite alters, the incidents of the romance, and very often changes their order. The numerous digressions, scientific and didactic, are entirely his own.

In the epilogue to Ahmedí's poem we are told that the work consists of 8,250 couplets, and that it was finished on the first day of the Latter Rebí' of 792 (19th. March, 1390), which date, it is added, corresponds to the years 1700 of Alexander, 759 of Yezdejird, and 310 of Melik Sháh. But additions were evidently made from time to time; thus in some manuscripts we find this allusion to the death of Prince Suleymán which occurred in 814 (1411): —

> Báyezíd and Timur kings were yesterday;
> Now on one the snake, on one the ant, doth prey.
> Yesterday reigned Mír Suleymán royally;
> Darksome dust within the earth to-day is he.
> Unto him with whom the power of vision lies
> Prince Suleymán's fate as warning will suffice. [1]

The Iskender-Náme opens with a number of introductory cantos, some celebrating in more or less mystic fashion the glory of God and the praises of the Prophet, others dealing with certain technical points of Súfí lore. When these preliminaries, which occupy many pages, have been got over, the author embarks upon the romance. This is divided into

[1] شاهدی دون بایزید یله تمور * بو کون انی مار ییر و بونی مور
میر سلیمانید دون ملکه پناه * بو کون اولدی یرده اوش خاك سیاه
هر کشی‌یه که انده ور نور بصر * میر سلیمان الدوکی عبرت یتر

These lines occur in the historical portion of the Iskender-Náme, where the author, when speaking of the destruction of Rustem's family, mentions as other examples of the instability of earthly greatness, the deaths of his own contemporaries, Báyezíd the Thunderbolt, Timur and Prince Suleymán. It is possible, but improbable, that the Mír Suleymán referred to is the King of Germiyan.

a series of Dástáns or 'Legends,' each devoted to some conquest or exploit of the hero. These Dástáns consist each of several cantos, each narrative canto being as a rule followed by one pointing out the moral lesson to be drawn. Leaving out of sight these preachments and also the scientific discussions, as forming no real part of the romance, the story of Iskender or Alexander, as given by Ahmedí, is in outline as follows: —

Dárá (Darius), the mighty King of Persia, conquers Rúm, and having killed the Cæsar, divides the country among a number of native nobles who are to rule as his vassals. Faylaqús (Philip) in this way receives the region of Yúnán (Ionia) subject to an annual tribute of a thousand golden eggs — such eggs, each a misqál in weight, forming, we are told, the money of those days. Darius also marries the daughter of Philip, but restores her to her father when he returns to his own capital Medá'in. [1] Before departing he leaves instructions that if the child born of her be a son, he is to receive all Rúm as his heritage and that Philip is to act as his guardian. Some time after his return home Darius dies and is succeeded by his son Dárab (Darius Codomanus). By and by there is born to Philip a grandson for whom the astrologers predict the most brilliant future, and whom Eflátún (Plato) and Buqrát (Hippocrates) name Iskender (Alexander). He is surnamed Zú-l-Qarnayn (i. e. 'He of the Two Horns,' 'the Bicorned,') because he is destined to conquer East and West, and because he was born with two tresses. Aristú (Aristotle) and Suqrát (Socrates) as well as Plato and Hippo-

[1] Medá'in, which in Arabic means 'Cities,' is the name given by the Muslim writers to that great city on the Tigris which the Byzantines called Ctesiphon. We are told that it consisted of seven cities (whence the name) which together formed the capital of the ancient Persian Empire. Little of Medá'in now remains above the ground save the ruins of the Táq-i Kisrá or 'Arch of the Chosroes,' built by the Kisrá, or Chosroes, Núshírewán.

crates are charged with his education, and so by the time he has reached his tenth year he is a philosopher versed in the mysteries of the heavens. Philip dies when Alexander is fifteen years old, whereupon the latter becomes king. His first act is to summon the four philosophers and ask them concerning the nature of things; they are explaining this in a materialistic fashion when Khizr,[1] who is present though not recognised, declares that matter is not eternal and that God formed the universe from nothing. He convinces Plato and then vanishes, whereupon they recognise who he is that had come to teach them the True Faith, which, on the King's suggestion, they accept. Alexander then asks each of the four to embody in a treatise his counsels, that these may aid him in the hard task of kingship; and this they accordingly do. One night Alexander sees in a vision an angel who gives a sword into his hand telling him to use it against his enemies, East and West having been given to him; which dream Aristotle interprets as a Divine promise that he will conquer the whole world.

Darius, who hears of Alexander's pretensions, is incensed and sends an ambassador demanding the annual tribute. Alexander bids the envoy tell his master that the bird that laid the golden eggs is dead, having been eaten by Philip during his last illness. Darius, furious at such an answer, sends a second envoy with a sack of millet which he empties out before Alexander. The latter, divining this to be a symbol of the magnitude of the host that will be led against him, sends for a cock which eats up all the millet, thus indicating that the vast army will be destroyed by a single person. Darius then assembles his countless hosts, the warriors not alone of Persia, but of the many regions subject to the Great King, and with these he marches exultant

[1] See p. 172, n. 1.

into Rúm. Alexander, whose brave bearing and eloquent words have won the hearts of his warriors to fight valiantly for him, advances to resist the foe. A furious battle follows which results in the utter defeat of Darius, whose camp and possessions fall into the hands of Alexander. Darius himself flies from the field, and as he is seeking some place of shelter he is overtaken and mortally wounded by two of his own nobles to whom he had given some offence. These thereupon go to Alexander and report what they have done, looking to be rewarded; but the King, indignant at their treachery, has them both hanged straightway. This is told to Darius, who is pleased at Alexander's justice, and sends him a message making over to him his kingdom and all his treasures. Alexander hastens to the dying King who with his last words confirms the gift. Alexander, who thus becomes King of Persia as well as of Rúm, proceeds to Medá'in where by the justice of his rule he wins the hearts of all. [1]

By and by Alexander resolves to lead an expedition into India, so he sends a letter to Keyd the king of that land, demanding his submission. Now Keyd is a wise prince; and as some little time before, he had been warned in a vision of the approach of an irresistible conqueror from Rúm, he determines to at once tender his submission and if possible

[1] In some MSS. there follows here a long dástán dealing with the love-adventures of Alexander and Gul-Sháh (Princess Rose) daughter of Zeresb the King of Zábulistán. This interlude I strongly suspect to be, if not altogether apochryphal, at any rate an after-thought and no part of the original scheme. My reasons for this opinion are these: 1, This dástán, and this alone, is omitted from many MSS. 2, Nothing in any way corresponding to it occurs in the Sháh-Náme version of the story, which Ahmedí elsewhere follows generally. 3, The literary style is different from that of the rest of the work; here alone are ghazels interspersed through the mesneví, in the fashion of Sheykhí and later poets. 4, It is awkwardly interpolated, having no connection with the story proper, and being evidently introduced merely for the sake of the love element which is otherwise quite unrepresented in the Iskender-Náme.

make a friend of the invincible invader. To this end he despatches an ambassador to Alexander not only to announce his submission, but to pray the Rúmí King to accept as an offering his four unique treasures, namely, his sage who knows the secrets of the spheres and the influences of the stars, his physician who can cure all ills save death alone, his bowl which, however much one drink from it, can never be emptied, and his peerless daughter Shehr Bánú.[1] The plan succeeds, and Alexander enters Keyd's territory as a friend. The two kings meet and feast together and exchange gifts. Alexander tests the Indian sage by requiring the explanation of a number of symbolic actions, and then asks him about the beginnings of the universe and of man; after which he inquires of the physician concerning the body of man and the nature of the mind.

In the spring Alexander determines to march against Fúr (Porus), another Indian king, who however refuses to follow Keyd's example, and prepares to resist the aggressor. He has in his army many elephants, animals new to Alexander, who none the less devises a stratagem to put them to flight. He constructs a number of artificial elephants, filled inside with inflammable materials, which are set on trolleys and pulled along in front of his soldiers. When the two armies meet, the trolleys are driven right up to the elephants, which are in front of the Indian troops, the combustible materials are then set ablaze, whereupon Fúr's elephants turn in terror, and rushing back upon the Indian lines, throw everything into confusion. The Rúmí-Persian army then attacks, when the Indians are totally defeated, and Fúr himself is slain. By this victory Alexander becomes lord-paramount of all India.

[1] Shehr Bánú, i. e. 'Lady of the City;' in some MSS. the name is Shehd Bánú, i. e. 'Lady Honey.'

Having settled affairs in his new possession, Alexander, accompanied by his army and his sages, sets out on his long course of wanderings, wanderings to which he is impelled as much by his intense desire to see the wonders of the world as by his lust of conquest. He begins by exploring the islands of the China Sea.[1] The first place at which the flotilla touches is the Island of Rá'ij; here they find a creature in human form, but winged, and speaking a tongue they cannot understand; they see also a huge mountain infested by snakes as large as dragons; and they catch a parrot belonging to a species that can learn any human language they hear spoken. In the same island grows the camphor-tree, in the shade of which a hundred persons can rest; all summer these trees also are infested by huge snakes so that no one can approach them, the natives therefore shoot at them arrows to which they have affixed their own names, and when winter is come and the snakes are gone, each man appropriates the tree in which his arrow has stuck, and draws the camphor from it. Alexander and his warriors sail next to the Isle of Ráziya where gold grows on the ground like grass, and where they find a timid people who flee on their approach. The next halt is at the Isle of Wáq-Wáq[2] which is ruled by a queen who has an army of six thousand maidens, and who sends gifts to Alexander on hearing of his arrival; this island owes its name to a tree the fruit of

[1] The China Sea was *par excellence* the region of marvels. Most of the wonders seen by Alexander, as well as the names of most of the islands he visited, are taken from the works of the old geographers, Qazwíní, Idrísí and Ibn-ul-Verdí. Some are mentioned in the Arabian Nights story of Sindbad. Those matters are carefully investigated, and many points in connection with them elucidated, by M. van der Lith, in his fine edition of the Kitáb ʿAjá'ib el-Hind (Livre des Merveilles de l'Inde), Leyden, E. J. Brill, 1883-6.

[2] M. de Goeje has identified the Wáq-Wáq Isles with Japan, which is called Wo-Kwok in the Chinese dialect of Canton, where the Arab sailors doubtless learned the name. L. de Merveilles, pp. 295 et seq.

which cries out Wáq! Wáq! They proceed to another island where there is a very beautiful people who live among inaccessible mountains; also a race of dog-headed men. Alexander questions an old man whom he meets here concerning the ocean, and is told that someone else had inquired as to its depth, whereupon an angel had appeared and informed the questioner that a man who had fallen in three hundred years before was still falling, not yet having reached the bottom. The old man tells further of a great fish that seeks to swallow ships but can be driven off by the beating of drums; of a monster crab the shell of which when pounded and mixed with tutty is good for illnesses of the eye; of a wondrous deer; of a radiance that appears in the form of a bird whereat if one look, his eyes are dazzled, and on the appearance whereof the sky becomes as a garden while the sea shines with light and the waves are stilled; of a snake-bodied, elephant-headed fish; and of a creature that swims in the sea by day and flies through the air by night. As the climate of the Isle of Jába is pleasant, Alexander builds there a city which he calls Serendíb; he then subjects the whole island which was being torn by internal wars. In the Isle of the Tinnín (Dragon) he encounters a great dragon which eats two oxen every night. Alexander destroys this monster by filling two ox-skins with pitch and lime and leaving these in the path of the dragon who eats them and is burned. The next island is Selámit where they see a fountain flowing into a well; the drops of water as they descend into this well are changed into stones, white or black according as they fall by day or by night. Alexander reaches the Valley of Diamonds through which he is told none, not even dragons, may pass, as it is full of venomous snakes and as there blows in it a wind that turns stones to wax, though nothing can cut the diamonds there. The King determines

to obtain some of these, so he has a thousand eagles caught and kept foodless for two days, when he has pieces of meat thrown before their eyes into the Valley. The birds are then released, whereupon they fly down and pick up the pieces of meat to which many diamonds adhere; they are followed, and where they alight the precious stones are found. In another island the King sees a great palace concerning which he asks the Indian sage, who tells him that none can enter it and no one knows what it is. As they are speaking there issue from it a host of dog-headed men who attack Alexander's army, but are defeated and fly back into their stronghold. The King desires to follow them, but is dissuaded by the sage who declares to him that the place is enchanted.

Alexander now turns his face towards China, which when Tamghâj Khan, the king of that country, hears, he is sore perplexed. He however resolves to submit, and goes out to meet Alexander, and the two kings enter the Chinese capital together in triumph. The usual feasts and philosophical discussions ensue, and Alexander confirms Tamghâj in all his former rights. He next proceeds to the most eastern East and looks upon the rising-place of the sun. Then desirous of beholding the wonders of the West, he retraces his footsteps, and soon afterwards he has left China behind him. He is encamped in a lovely spot when he is accosted by a man who tells him that yesterday he saw a wonderful stone which changes from colour to colour and at night shines like a mirror. Alexander asks Aristotle of this and is told that the name of this stone is feylaqûs, that it is found in China and Russia, that he who possesses it can control the demons and enjoys safety from wild beasts and reptiles; but that the demons hide it lest any man should through it obtain mastery over them. After visiting a mine whence is obtained the metal khárchín from which are made poisoned

spear and arrow heads, but whereat if a paralytic look, he is cured, they proceed through Cashmere to the Turkish lands. A Turkish chieftain offers battle, and after a hard fight is defeated, whereupon his country is made over to the King of China. Alexander converts the people, who are heathen, to the Unity, and after the customary carouse, sets out on the search for new wonders. They encounter giant apes and one-horned hares on their way to the land of Tagharún whose inhabitants are men in form but brutes in nature, and where they see men with the heads of wolves and others with the faces of elephants or dogs.

Proceeding, they come to a place where are two great mountains with a gap between them, and beneath which dwells a feeble and timid folk. In reply to the King's questions, these tell him that they live in terror of Gog and Magog, two barbarous tribes, that dwell on the other side of the mountains and ever and anon descend upon them through the gap, and harry and lay waste their land. In response to their prayer for aid, Alexander gets together a vast array of workmen and blocks up the gap through which the savages come, by building in it a huge dyke or rampart. When this has reached the summits of the mountains he covers it over with pieces of metal which he then melts by means of blasts from innumerable furnaces so that, when the metal has cooled, mountains and dyke present one solid mass which nothing can penetrate. As this charitable action was done for the love of God, Alexander put much gold and silver among the metal on the dyke.

Having thus effectually barred the way of Gog and Magog, Alexander continues his journey. The Russians of Khazar try to stop his progress, but after a desperate battle they are defeated and their lands laid waste. The King then proceeds to Mázenderán in order to conquer the dívs or demons

whose head-quarters are in that province and of whose exploits he has heard. He fights a great battle with them, in the course of which a demon leaps upon his shoulders and cannot be displaced till smitten down by an angel from heaven. When the fiends have been utterly defeated, Alexander passes into Khurásán, and there founds the cities of Merv, Samarcand and Herat.

The next country visited is Egypt, where the King sees the pyramids and many other marvels. He founds there the city of Alexandria which he names after himself and makes his capital. He builds in this city a pillar, on which is set a glass called the gíti-numá or 'world-displayer,' wherein is reflected all the good and all the evil done throughout the world. Besides this, there is erected on the pillar a talismanic figure of a man which turns towards the quarter where any enemy is plotting against the city; and there is likewise another talisman which keeps the city free from snakes and all stinging things. [1]

Meanwhile Qayzáfa, [2] the great Queen of the Sunset-land (Maghrib), [3] having heard of the mighty deeds of Alexander, sends a clever painter to Egypt, who, without the King's knowing it, takes his portrait and carries it back to his mistress. Alexander on his part hears of the splendour and power of Qayzáfa, and straightway desiring that she too be subject to him, sends an ambassador demanding her sub-

[1] Ahmedí tells how those talismans were destroyed through the craft of a Frank who having ingratiated himself with the ᶜAbbásí Khalífa of the day, persuaded him by means of a lying story of a treasure hidden beneath, to demolish the pillar whereon they stood.

[2] This name قیذافه should perhaps be transliterated Qaydáfa, the ذ being often written ذ in old Persian books.

[3] Maghrib, literally the 'Sunset-land' or the 'Land of the Setting,' is constantly mentioned in Eastern romance. It vaguely represents the western regions of the earth (as then known), especially Barbary or North-western Africa with Spain and Portugal.

mission. She replies by bidding him beware of presumption and arrogance. On receiving this answer, he sets out against her with a vast army, and on his way he comes to a great city, which he takes. Qayzáfa's son Qandarúsh, who is married to the daughter of the king of this city, is here made prisoner along with his wife. In order himself to spy out the resources of Qayzáfa's land, Alexander devises and executes a stratagem; he makes his vezir assume the royal dress and personate the king, while he disguises himself as a simple noble, and when Qandarúsh and his wife are led out to be executed, he intercedes for them with the fictitious king and obtains their freedom, and having thus won their gratitude, he accompanies them in the character of an ambassador to the court of Qayzáfa. The Queen, who recognises the King from his portrait, asks his errand, whereupon he declares that he is an ambassador from Alexander who demands her submission; this she again refuses. After he has given a false name in answer to her questions, Qayzáfa tells him that he himself is Alexander and shows him his own portrait. On finding himself thus discovered, the King is in terror for his life; but the Queen reassures him, and after making him swear never to lead an army against her, proposes a treaty of alliance, to which he agrees. He is then presented with many gifts and set at liberty. But no sooner is he in safety, than, tormented by the thought that he has had to treat with another sovereign as with his equal, he schemes the destruction of Qayzáfa and her land. Precluded by his oath from drawing the sword against her, he is compelled to fall back on stratagem. The Sunset-land lies at a lower level than Rúm, so in order to destroy the former, he causes great canals to be dug to it from the Sea of Rúm, which is then allowed to enter these canals, and thus the Sunset-land is submerged, and Qayzáfa and all her subjects are drowned.

When they hear of this, all the remaining kings of the earth, dreading the violence and craft of Alexander, offer him their submission, and he becomes lord-paramount of the whole world. But still he is not satisfied, and sighs that there are no more worlds to conquer. Scorning his vezir's counsel to be content, he fits out a ship with provisions for a year and gives it in charge to a skilful captain and crew, who have with them two learned men from each of the nations of the world, and who are bidden sail the seas for a year and see whether there be still any land unconquered. They sail for a whole year but see nothing, and are about to return when they perceive another ship. This they approach, but though they have with them interpreters for seventy-two languages, they are unable to understand a word of the strangers' speech. The two crews agree by signs that a man from each ship shall go and stay for a time in the other so that he may learn the language and tell what there is to tell. Alexander's ship returns with the stranger on board, and when the latter has learned the Rúmí tongue, he is brought before the King to whom he tells that in the world whence he comes there is likewise a king whose name is Alexander and who, having conquered all the kingdoms there, had despatched that ship with two years' provisions to bring him tidings of the earth, of which he now desires to possess himself.

On hearing this, Alexander's pride is somewhat abated, and he bids Aristotle tell him the history of all that has happened and that shall happen upon the earth. In response to this command the sage gives a sketch of the history of the world as this was known in Ahmedí's time, beginning with Keyúmers the first legendary king of Persia and coming down to the time of the composition of the Iskender-Náme. In the course of this history Alexander hears of the future advent of the Prophet and of the glories of Baghdad; and

anxious to behold the sacred Kaʿba and the city where the Khalífas are to rule, he again sets out with his great army. Having visited Baghdad, he proceeds towards the Hijáz, on the way to which he comes upon a monastery which he enters and where he sees an ancient monk who continues his devotions utterly regardless of the great King's presence. On Alexander's asking what he means by this behaviour, the monk replies that it were unbecoming he should bow down to a slave of his slave. Alexander demands an explanation of his words, whereupon he says, 'Thou art the slave of lust whose master I am.' The King is pleased with this answer, and prays the monk to give him some helpful counsel, which he does.[1] The next object Alexander encounters is a lofty palace, the door of which, though guarded by a talisman, opens to his hand. On entering he perceives upon a gold and ivory throne the body of a king, and hard by a tablet setting forth that this is ʿÁd, conqueror of East and West, who ruled for twelve hundred years till death came to him, when none could save him, and bidding the reader beware of trust in the world and of pride; and when Alexander reads this he weeps. The King passes on and reaches Mekka, where he performs all the rites of the pilgrimage. When he has heard the history of the city, he leaves and proceeds to Jerusalem, after visiting which, he returns to Egypt. There he reigns in all prosperity and splendour; and sages repair thither from every land, and study and write books.

Alexander sees now that his fortune is at the zenith, and as he knows that declension must follow every ascension, his heart is grieved. A sage who perceives the traces of care upon his face, asks the reason, and when the King tells him, he replies that in the Farthest East springs the Fountain

[1] This story is told likewise of Diogenes the Cynic (Diyúgánes-i Kelbí) and the king of his day.

of Life, of which if any drink, he lives for ever in the world, but that the way thereto is very hard. When he hears of this, Alexander is rejoiced as though he had already found the Water, and straightway appoints as regent his son Iskenderús, and accompanied by Khizr and a mighty army, sets out for the distant East. On his march he comes to the City of the Brahmans, a mountain in the caves of which dwell countless naked and fasting devotees; and on his asking their chiefs why they thus live apart from mankind and abstain from food, he is answered that there is other food than bread. Going on, he comes to a vast dome, under which he enters, and there in a jewel-adorned room, on a ruby throne, he sees a dead man, and by him a tablet bearing an inscription in which he (Alexander) is addressed by name and told that this dẹad man was likewise a King Zú-l-Qarnayn, that he lived four thousand years ago, and that he too having conquered East and West, had got so far on his journey in quest of the Fount of Life. Proceeding onwards, they pass through plains and valleys and forests filled with wild boars and snakes and tigers till they reach the Land of the Witches who seek to bar their progress by causing to spring up before them an enchanted fire, which, however, is extinguished by a great rain sent from heaven in response to Khizr's prayer. A month's further journey brings them to the City of Shád-Kám (Fulfilled Desire), all the inhabitants of which are women. The Queen hospitably receives them and directs them on their way to the Fount of Life which lies no great distance off in the midst of a dense and impenetrable Darkness, the beginnings of which can be seen from the spot to which their lady-guides accompany them. Alexander and his army then advance into the Darkness wherein the Fount is hid; but ere they have got very far, they are assailed by a terrific storm which destroys half the host and scatters

the remainder in hopeless confusion. When Alexander becomes conscious of what has happened, he realises that the Water of Life is not for him; so he and what is left of his army grope their way through the Blackness out into the light as best they may. Meanwhile Khizr, who in the confusion wrought by the storm, had got separated from all the others, comes without trouble upon the Fount of Life, and drinks thereof; and so he lives for ever, though he is never seen again by Alexander or his warriors.

These, on issuing from the Darkness, encamp in a plain in the centre of which is a great tree beneath whose shade Alexander lies down to sleep. At midnight, when all are asleep save the King, he hears the tree sighing and wailing; it then addresses him, asking why he still thus lusts after conquest seeing that his end is near, and reproaching him with having made no provision for the future and with having got no real happiness from his life. When he hears the words of the tree, the King is filled with dismay, and on the morrow he is taken ill; and the army hastens back towards Persia. At a certain place on the road Alexander is attacked with sudden weakness, and there he writes a farewell letter to his mother Rúqiyá Khatun. They proceed to Shehr-rúz, where the King's sickness increases on him, and where Plato vainly tries to cure him. He then gives instructions as to his funeral, and dies. His body is taken to Alexandria where his mother visits his bier, and mourning over him, cries that while he went in search of the Water of Life, he drained the cup of Death. He is buried in that city with the utmost pomp; but when his body is being carried to the grave, one hand is left exposed, so that all may take warning, seeing how Alexander who possessed the whole world goes empty-handed as he came. His mother commands each of the Greek sages to write an epitaph on him, and then seeks out his son

Iskenderús to seat him in his father's place. But this Prince is a philosopher and hates sovereignty, so he refuses the crown and retires into holy seclusion. Anarchy therefore and confusion fill the Eastern world till King Ardeshír, the first of the Sasanians, appears and once again brings order to those lands.

Such is the history of Alexander as recounted by Ahmedí. In this history there is one incident which seems in a pre-eminent degree to have laid hold of the imagination of the Eastern poets. This is the King's futile quest of the Water of Life in the Land of Darkness and the discovery of that Fountain by Khizr. It is not too much to say that there is scarcely an Ottoman poet of any importance who has not in one way or another made allusion to this famous adventure. As we proceed we shall find constant references to it and endless fancies suggested by it, so it will be well to bear this part of the story in our minds. We shall also meet with allusions to the Dyke of Gog and Magog, and to what the poets call the 'Mirror of Alexander,' which would appear to be identical with the talismanic glass that Ahmedí says was set up on the pillar at Alexandria. The King himself is often mentioned as the type of a mighty conqueror and powerful monarch, and the proudest of the Sultans held it for a compliment to be compared to this great forerunner.

Perhaps because the absence of any love-interest rendered it less suitable material for Súfí allegorising, the story of Alexander was less popular as a subject with the Turkish writers than any other of the stock-romances of the Persians; and so while we find several versions, by as many different poets, of the stories of Khusrev and Shírín, of Leylí and Mejnún, and of Joseph and Zelíkhá, there is, as far as I know, only one other Iskender-Náme in West-Turkish literature. This is by an obscure Ottoman poet called Ṭighání,

who wrote about the end of the fifteenth century; but it never achieved any success, and is now practically forgotten. [1]

The Iskender-Náme is far from being the sole outcome of Ahmedí's literary labours. He wrote an immense number of qasídas and ghazels; these have been collected and form a large Díwán, a manuscript of which is in the British Museum. [2]

The style of these lyric poems differs much from that of the Iskender-Náme; far more attention has been paid to matters of technique; there is here a striving after felicity, if not curiosity, of expression, which is wholly absent from the romance. The metres are regularly Persian, although frequent violations of the strict prosodial rules still occur. There is a much more sparing use of the license of elision. Many of the poems are addressed to Mír Sulmán; but whether the King of Germiyan or Prince Suleymán is intended, is not always determinable. Ahmedí's Díwán is quite in the Persian style and taste. It is very unlike that of his contemporary Cadi Burhán-ud-Dín which was no doubt being written while his own Iskender-Náme was in process of composition. If the bulk of Ahmedí's lyrics, as we have them, was produced during the fourteenth century, then the settlement of West-Turkish prosody must have been effected somewhat before the Tartar invasion.

Latífí says that Ahmedí translated most of the qasídas of the Persian poets Selmán and Zahír. While it is quite possible that Ahmedí did study and 'parallel,' or even translate, some of the works of these two poets, this statement of Latífí's need not be taken literally. It was the fashion among Ottoman writers of the fifteenth and sixteenth cen-

[1] There is a much better-known version of the story by Mír ʿAlí Shír-i Newáʾí; but this of course is in Jaghatay or Eastern Turkish, and so does not come within our sphere.

[2] Or. 4127. The Díwán is unprinted.

turies to bracket the names of Selmán and Zahír with that of any poet they wished to commend, without meaning that there was any actual resemblance; thus to say that so and so's qasídas were as those of Selmán and Záhír, implied nothing more than that they were excellent. [1]

Latífí credits Ahmedí with a second romantic mesneví, 'Jemshíd and Khurshíd' by name. In this he is borne out by Kátib Chelebi who mentions two Turkish poems with that title, one by Ahmedí of Germiyan and one by the poetess Hubbí [2] who flourished in the sixteenth century. Of this romance of Ahmedí's I have been unable to find any particulars. It is not unlikely that it was suggested by, perhaps translated from, a poem of the same name written in 763 (1362) by the Persian Selmán whom Latífí says he followed. If this be so, the Jemshíd who is hero of the romance is not the celebrated half-legendary king of ancient Persia, but a wholly imaginary prince, son of the Faghfúr or Emperor of China, while the heroine Khurshíd is the daughter of the Cæsar of Rúm.

Several of the biographers mention further a versified treatise on medicine as being among Ahmedí's works; and Kátib Chelebi speaks of a Turkish poem called Suleymán-

[1] Zahír-ud-Dín-i Fáryábí (see p. 144, n. 2.), who died in 598 (1201-2), and Selmán Sávejí, who died about 779 (1377-8), are among the greatest of the Persian qasída-writers. They probably owed the position of conventional paragon that they held among the Turks to the following passage from one of the ghazels of Háfiz in which the great Persian poet flatters himself on having outdone them: —

چه جای گفتهٔ خواجو و شعر سلمانست
که شعر حافظ ما به ز نظم خوب ظهیر

What place is there for the ditties of Kh'ájú and the poetry of Selmán? For the poetry of our Háfiz is better than the fair verse of Zahír.

[2] In Fluegel's edition this name is wrongly printed جنی and transliterated Jeni.

Náme or 'The Book of Suleymán,' which he says is by Ahmedí of Germiyan. This last may perhaps be the accomplishment of a pious purpose expressed in the Iskender-Náme, where, after the account of Prince Suleymán's reign at the close of the historical sketch, the author declares his intention, provided life be accorded him, of writing a book entirely devoted to the exploits of his patron.

We shall now translate a few extracts from such of Ahmedí's works as are accessible.

From the Iskender-Náme. [40]

Alexander buildeth the Dyke of Gog and Magog.

Journeying onward, did the King two mountains reach, —
Even to the moon upsoared the peak of each. [1]
When the King of Earth was come those mountains nigh,
There a passing wretched folk did he espy.
Woman-like were all, and naked and forlorn,
All of them by hunger's hand distraught and worn.
When the Monarch asked them of their case, did they
Answer thus: 'O King, live thou on earth for aye!
'Howsoe'er the Sphere may turn, do thou remain!
'Sure and steadfast may the Lord thy throne maintain!
'May the Etern eternal life on thee bestow!

[1] For Muhammedan peoples the source of the story of Gog and Magog (Ye'júj and Me'júj), which appear to have been the names of barbarous Turkman tribes, is the following passage from the 18th. chapter of the Koran: "Then he (Alexander) followed a way, until when he reached to between the two ramparts (i. e. mountains) he found below them a folk who could scarce understand speech. Said they, 'O Bicorned! verily Gog and Magog are evil-doers on the earth; so shall we bring to thee tribute on that thou settest between us and them a dyke?' Said he, 'What my Lord hath established me in is better, so aid me with strength and I will set between you and them a rampart. Bring me lumps of iron until they fill up the space between the mountain-sides.' Said he, 'Blow until that it maketh a fire.' Said he, 'Bring me that I may pour over it, molten brass.' And they (Gog and Magog) could not scale it, neither could they tunnel it."

'Ne'er may thy prosperity declension know!
'Neither man nor jinn nor lion, pard nor drake [1]
'From thy fearful onslaught e'er escape did make.
'Thou hast swept disorder from the earth away,
'Through thy justice blooms the world a garden gay.
'Since, O Monarch, thou hast asked us of our plight,
'Hearken that our case before thee we recite.
'Haply for this ill thou'lt find some remedy,
'Haply this hard knot by thee unloosed will be.
'There beyond these mountains, hills and plains untold
'Stretch, and therein Gog and Magog have their hold.
'If we till the land or if the fields we sow,
'Gog and Magog come and waste whate'er we do.
'All their work is but to ravage and oppress,
'All they do is but to ruin and distress.
'Half the stature of a man their height indeed;
'Unto one a thousand, — such the rate they breed.
'Like the boar's, their bodies bristle o'er with hair,
'Passing sharp and long the nails and claws they bear.
'Naught is there with them of any human grace,
'Neither of religion show they any trace.
'Though the sands may numbered be, O mighty King,
'Yet of those there is nor tale nor reckoning.
'There, between these mountains twain, O King of Earth,
'Lies the road by which they alway issue forth.
'Other way there is not whereby they might pass.
'Let the Monarch find some help for this our case.
'So that in the Sovran's reign the folk be glad,
'So that be the Sovran's name with blessings said.
'Surely he whose name with blessings said shall be,
'In the Here and the Hereafter glad shall be!
'We too shall bestir ourselves and lend our aid.
''Tween the mountains let a dyke by thee be made;
'That such dyke may ever henceforth block their path,
'And this land no more be wasted by their wrath.'
Said the King, 'To God be thanks that He Most Great
'Made me not on any creature's aidance wait.

[1] Drake, i. e. dragon.

'Ne'er a need have I of any creature's aid.
'So that God but help me, shall the Dyke be made.'
Therefore for a season there the King did stay,
And he gathered workmen in untold array.
Gold and silver there for stone and iron he
Used, because he built this Dyke for charity.
(Spend thy wealth in charity, if gracious thou;
Hide it not, elsewise thy name is mean and low.)
So the King renowned upreared a mighty wall
Till it reached the peaks of those two mountains tall.
Then were bits of iron and of copper laid
Wheresoe'er the wall a space or gap displayed;
Furnaces the King of Persia next supplied,
Blasts were blown on yonder wall from every side;
Thus the metals melted were and fused in one,
And the Dyke made solid, so that flaw was none. [1]
Grace from God the Lord was granted, yea, and aid,
So the Dyke was builded in the way I've said.
Gog and Magog on the farther side remain;
Never, never may they hither pass again.
But what time the Eternal One shall give decree,
And the Last Day nears, the Dyke shall riven be; [2]
Through the same shall Gog and Magog issue forth,
And lay waste and spoil the Seven Climes of earth. [3]

[1] The process of building this Dyke is more explicitly set forth in the Shâh-Náme. A huge wall, reaching as high as their summits, was built between the two mountains; this was stopped up and covered over with pieces of rough iron and copper; the whole structure was then heated red-hot with hot blasts from innumerable furnaces, and so the pieces of metal were melted and fused together; the result being that mountains and Dyke formed one solid mass, through or over which it was impossible to pass.

[2] This alludes to the tradition (referred to in the Koran, xxi, 96.) that shortly before the Last Day, Gog and Magog shall be let loose from their captivity behind Alexander's Dyke.

[3] For the Seven Climes, i.e. the whole habitable world, see p. 47, n. 1.

From the Iskender-Náme. [41]

Alexander seeketh the Fountain of Life.

Thence again pushed on the King and his meinie
Till they reached a spot whence they the Mirk could see.
Quoth they [1] to the King, 'O Monarch haught and high,
'Yonder Fountain lieth in the Mirk hard by.
'Though but short the stage betwixt that place and here,
'Mickle dour from end to end the way and drear.'
Quoth the King, 'The Lord may smooth for us the road;
'All its rough and smooth can be made one by God.
'Seeing how as pain is set by side of gain,
'Needs must he who seeks the gain aby the pain!
'Till that one in Love's behalf do dolour dree,
'Never may he win his heart's beloved to see.'
Then he rose with all his host and went his way,
Straight he pierced within the Mirk that darkling lay.
On they fared amid the gloom and dark a space,
Till, behold, down swept as 'twere the night apace!
Roared the thunder, round them flared the lightning-blaze,
Thou hadst deeméd East and West one flaming maze.
Surging wild from forth the heavens, oceans crashed;
Thronging fast from forth the earth, the torrents dashed.
Such the flood that o'er them burst that Noah's flood
Straightway were o'erwhelmed thereby and quick subdued.
Darkness treading upon darkness, onward pressed,
That the abysmal gloom had fallen, thou hadst guessed.
King and warriors lost their wits and lost their way;
Wandering there, they each from each went far astray.
When they might no longer one the other see,
Far and wide they wandered in perplexity.
Khizr, he who on that journey was the guide,
'Gainst his will was parted from the Monarch's side.
Some of yonder folk the raging floods did drown,
Some the lightning burned, and some the wind cast down;
Other some were lost with ne'er a trace to tell

[1] i. e. the guides from Shád-Kám.

Whether they were dead or bode alive and well.
When the King beheld this woeful plight he knew
That he ne'er should find the way the Fountain to;
For the thing that is not one's allotted share, —
Howso much he seek it, he shall win to ne'er.
Helpless then and hopeless, back he turned again;
But the road he came by, now he sought in vain.
Faring on, they lighted on a wonder-land,
Where for stones did gleaming jewels strew the sand;
Some were rubies, some spinels of purest ray,
Some were turkis, — there in heaps untold they lay.
All around lay jewels as the Night-lamp [1] bright,
Shone the mountains with those jewels' radiant light.
King and army of those priceless gems a store
Took, and started on their journey drear once more.
On they toiled a space with bitter stress and ghast,
When on sudden forth from out the Mirk they passed.
Then they looked, and saw how full a half their host,
Left behind within the Dark and Mirk, was lost.
Vainly sought they Khizr all the army through,
Whither he was vanished there was none who knew.
Naught of him they knew, but he his way had gone,
And withouten stress the Stream of Life had won.
Seeing how that Water was to him decreed,
Needs must he his portion find, howe'er he speed.
That which unto any is not fore-ordained
Ne'er by him, yea surely, ne'er shall be attained.
That which unto any is the destined share
Shall ere long befall him sans distress or care.
Mid the Mirk Iskender suffered mickle pain;
Pain it was his portion, Khizr's was the gain.
Ne'er may God's allotment change or turning bear,
Ne'er may any seize another's destined share.

[1] The fabled gem known as Sheb-chirágh 'the Night-lamp' is thus described in the famous Persian dictionary called Burhán-i Qáti^{c}: — 'Sheb-chirágh (Night-lamp): This is a jewel which during the night-time shineth like a lamp. They say that on certain nights when the water-bull cometh up to land to graze, he bringeth this jewel with him in his mouth, and setteth it down on the place where he would graze, and by the light of it doth he graze.'

From the Iskender-Náme. [42]

Alexander is forewarned of his Death by a Tree.

When the King set out from yonder region there
Came he to a plain with verdure filled and fair,
In the midst whereof there grew a shady tree,
Thou hadst deemed it was the Túba,[1] verily.
So he ordered that the camp should there be pight;
And beneath that tree the King lay down that night.

When that full a half the night was past and gone,
And asleep were all except the Unsleeping One,[2]
Yonder tree began to moan and bitter-wail,
Saying, 'O much-suffering King who seekest bale!
'How this lust hath made thee wander sans relief!
'What availeth store of wealth if life be brief?
'Now thy life hath touched its end, what makes thee then
'Still so eager and so keen the world to gain?
'E'en as thou hast seen, thy fortune waxed complete;
'Know that still completion must declension meet.
'Thou hast reigned as Sovran full four years and ten,
'Yet for e'en one day thou hast not happy been.
'All this hast thou won, yet had thereof no bliss.
'Never saidst thou: "When I die, another's this."
'Lo, thou goest, and thy hoards to others fall.
'Vain thy travail and thy labour, vain it all!
'Ah! the pity of thy weary stress and pain,
'For that never shall thy hand the treasure gain!'

When the King heard from the tree those words of dole
'Twas as though his body had farewelled his soul.
Sick upon the morn from thence did he arise;
Dry his lips, but wet with bitter tears his eyes.
On they pushed a while alike by night and day,
Till that once again to Persia come were they.

The following ghazels are from Ahmedí's Díwán.

[1] For the Túba Tree, see p. 36.
[2] i. e. God.

Ghazel. [43]

Bear greetings unto yonder belov'd dearling fair, O breeze;
My message give to yonder sweetheart debonair, O breeze.

Spread thou her tresses violet[1] all o'er her rosy cheek;
Waft ambergris and essences sweet through the air, O breeze.[2]

Wouldst seek her dwelling? Privily go there, I pray of thee;
Take heed thou show thee not to the vile rival[3] there, O breeze.

My secret I've confided to thee, giving thee my trust;
For Heaven's sake to utter it do thou forbear, O breeze.

Do thou present my friendlessness 'fore yonder dearest one;
May be that she will medicine this ill I bear, O breeze.

Say, 'Wherefore still so cruelly wound Ahmedí forlorn?'
To her whose glances troubles bestrew everywhere, O breeze.

Ghazel. [44]

Drunk straight becometh he who to thine eyen falls a prey,
While turns the captive of thy locks from food and sleep away.

My night is through thy tresses the Assignment-Night or Power;[4]
My day doth through thy face as the Sun's exaltation ray.

[1] Violet, i. e. dark and sweet-scented tresses.

[2] Playing with her sweet-scented hair, the breeze wafts abroad delightful odours.

[3] The 'rival' is a constant figure in Eastern love-poetry.

[4] Leylet-ul-Qadr 'the Night of Power,' and Leylet-ul-Berát 'the Night of Assignments' are two of the most sacred nights of the Muslim year.

The Night of Power is that on which the Koran was sent down from Heaven. It is one of the ten last nights of the month of Ramazán, but opinions differ as to which; the eve of the 27th. is that held officially. The belief is that all this night angels are descending from Heaven bringing blessings to the righteous among the Faithful.

The Night of Assignments, which is the eve of the 15th. of Shaᶜbán, is to the devout the most solemn night in the calander; for it is held that on it is confirmed the fate of every living man for the ensuing year.

One crieth: 'Through thy promise shall I win to reach thy lip!'
See how for him the Water of Life gleams mirage-like aye.

Within thy tresses waileth my heart sore at eventide;
Alway the stranger's portion is sad sorrow, sad dismay.

Like tears from out mine eyen have I this existence shed;
Nay, this beseems me not, that there be veil betwixt us tway.[1]

E'en though they drain my blood, are my tears water of my face;[2]
Through these the door is opened to my burning fire to-day.

So be it needful, bear with the Friend's rigour, Ahmedí;
Since liver-blood[3] is turnéd to pure musk by time in fay.[4]

Ghazel. [45]

Thy face nor sun nor moon as rival oweth;
And like thy mouth no pearl-filled casket glowet

Thy hair, it is a handful basil,[6] natheless
In my sad lot to darksome snake it groweth.

Thy glance hath ta'en my soul although I sinned not;
What then my plight an I had sinned — who knoweth!

[1] This couplet may be taken mystically, phenomenal existence being the veil between the Lover and the Beloved, i. e. between the soul and God.

[2] 'Water of the face' is a metaphor for honour or self-respect. Here the expression is used both literally and metaphorically. The tears are said to drain the blood in allusion to an idea already mentioned (p. 217, n. 1.) They open a door to the fire of love in the heart, as through them the anguish of passion finds vent. The juxtaposition of the names of the elements is reckoned a beauty in this style of poetry.

[3] With the Oriental, as with the earlier European, poets the liver is the seat of passion, the heart being that of affection.

[4] Alluding to the fact that musk is obtained from the fluid contained in a cyst or gland near the navel of the musk-deer. This fluid dries into the brown substance used as a perfume.

[5] The mouth of a beauty is sometimes compared to a ruby casket filled with pearls, the pearls of course being the teeth.

[6] The comparison of the hair to basil is not uncommon.

[7] The comparison of the curl of a beauty to a deadly snake is a commonplace of Eastern poetry.

Attained had I the goal on thy Love's pathway,
If so my luck had been a steed that goeth.

To talk of gems anent thy lip were shameful,
To talk of jet beside thy mole thus showeth.[1]

A-yearning ever for thy violet tresses,
My heart now moans and now its weeping floweth.

Be God alway the Guardian of thy beauty! —
Such blessing Ahmedí on thee bestoweth.

Ghazel. [46]

He who thy bright face the rose, thy locks the basil fair, hath made,
This my heart distraught and frenzied through thy love for e'er hath made.

Telleth each some diff'rent story of the nature of thy form;
Clear is this, that God the same of Him to witness bear hath made.

Know not I what way to bring to voice the story of thy mouth;[2]
For that God a hidden secret of that Essence[3] rare hath made.

Troublous is thine eye and languishful this day; O may it be
Yonder witch black-hearted dire and fell a wound e'en there hath made?[4]

[1] Thy lip is so much redder than the ruby, thy mole is so much blacker than jet.

[2] The smallness of the beauty's mouth has already been referred to (p. 217, n. 5.). It is hard to describe that which scarcely exists (being so small).

[3] The word gevher (jevher) means the essential nature of a thing, and this of course cannot be described in words. But there is an ímám or amphibology here; gevher means also a jewel, and it is usual for the sake of security to keep jewels in some secret place. This same word gevher (in the Arabicised form of jevher) enters into the term jevher-i ferd or atom; the connection between the atom and the mouth of the beloved we have already seen (p. 217, n. 5.).

[4] This couplet is obscure; it seems to mean: 'thine eye, O beloved, is to-day more than usually full of languor; perhaps that black-hearted witch (itself) has stricken its eye (itself).' The 'black-hearted witch' being of course the beloved's black-pupiled eye which ensorcels lovers, the idea would be that her eye has bewitched itself, i. e. that she has looked upon and fallen in love with her own beauty, and is therefore filled with languishment.

Let them seek thee, thou art Khizr's and Iskender's goal; for God
That thy lip Life's Fount, the Darkness that thy dusky hair hath made.[1]

Loosed the west wind mid thy fragrant locks one tress at morning-tide;
Yea, 'tis yonder waft that ambergris-perfumed the air hath made.

He who decked thy face with hyacinth[2] and basil and narcisse,[3]
He 'tis Ahmedí that garden's praises to declare hath made.

Ghazel.[4] [47]

What vision Thou who 'rt in entirety light![5]
Who 'rt such that shows the sun less plenteously light.

To me full clear it is since I have seen Thee
That sun and moon win from Thy visnomy light.

A breath of Love from Thee reached dawn, and therefore
Are land and sea for joyous ecstasy light.

The eve 's a scantling darkness from Thy tresses,
The dawn is from Thy face a summary light.

Did but Thy beauty's sun shine out in splendour,
Were every atom in existency light.

If flash Thy Face unveiled at the Last Judgment,
Will hell-fire gleam in sheeny radiancy light.

For this 'tis Ahmedí for Thy Love burneth: —
By burning doth the taper come to be light.

[1] We have not had to wait long for an example of the fancies suggested by the story of Alexander and the Water of Life.

[2] The fragrant hyacinth is the commonest of all the conventional comparisons for a beauty's curling tresses.

[3] The narcissus is the most usual of the comparisons for the eye.

[4] In imitation of the method followed in the original, a weak syllable immediately preceding the redíf (light) is made to bear the rhyme-stress in the translation. To get the effect of the Turkish, the last syllable in the words 'entirety,' 'plenteously,' 'visnomy' etc. must be slightly accentuated, although this being foreign to our usage, is unpleasing to the English ear.

[5] This ghazel is throughout mystic in purport.

The ghazel that follows is given as an example of those written in praise of Mír Sulmán, probably Prince Suleymán; and is no better than court-poetry is wont to be.

Ghazel. [48]

Mír Sulmán (may God defend him!), when he drains the bowl of wine,
From the fountain of his visage lustrous doth the radiance shine.

Clear as noontide is the purport of 'Their Lord shall give them drink,'[1]
Whensoe'er unto his servants proffers he the bowl of wine.

When the Drinker lights the beaker,[2] from the Unseen World a voice
Soundeth through the skies proclaiming, 'Hail to thee! Sultán benign!'

Lo, his feast is Paradisal, here be Rizwán's[3] houris fair;
Yea, and fruit and wine and taper, harp and rebeck, all as digne.

Who is he who quaffs the wine with him? One draught of such an one
Straightway would a thousand senses unto drunkenness consign.

Howsoever much he drink, his understanding clearer grows;
Sugar is 't he drinks, or water from Life's Stream, I can't divine.

Whoso meeteth him in battle Mars or Saturn[4] would declare;
Whoso seeth him in banquet would the sun-bright Moon opine.

Rolling thunder is his slogan, and a lightning-flash his whip,
Yea, a thunderbolt his sabre, and his shafts do meteors shine.

[1] In the Koran, lxxvi, 21, it is written concerning the blessed in Paradise: 'On them shall be garments of green embroidered satin and brocade; and they shall be adorned with bracelets of silver; and their Lord shall give them to drink pure drink!' Here the last phrase is detached from the context and audaciously applied to the entertainment of his boon-companions by the Prince.

[2] i. e. when the Prince fills it with bright wine.

[3] Rizwán, the angel who has charge of Paradise, has already been mentioned.

[4] Saturn and Mars are the two malefic planets in astrology.

Sheen of battle and of banquet, Ornament of crown and throne;
Such is he among the people, 'and God knoweth best'[1] in fine.

Ahmedí, and so thou seek thee fortune, never absent be
From yon Prince's feast, for this the saying, ''tis the absent tine.'[2]

[1] وَ ٱللّٰهُ أَعْلَمُ بِالصَّوَابِ 'and God knoweth best,' a constantly quoted Arabic phrase.

[2] مَنْ غَابَ خَابَ 'whoso is absent suffereth loss,' a well-known Arabic proverb.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ROMANCISTS (CONTINUED)

Sheykhí.

Sheykhí, whose name, as we have seen, Latífí couples in a somewhat suspicious story with that of Ahmedí, is a figure of considerable importance in the history of Turkish literature; for it is by him that the Persian artistic mesneví was introduced among the Western Turks. This poet, whose personal name was Sinán, was born in Kutahiya the capital of the little state of Germiyan, the birthplace of so many of the poets of those days. If we are to trust the Crimson Peony, Sheykhí studied first under Ahmedí. Somewhat later, according to all the authorities, he became a disciple of the famous mystic teacher and saint Hajji Beyrám of Angora,[1] under whose tuition he attained a high point in Súfiistic lore. Latífí speaks of a journey to Persia undertaken in early life for the purpose of visiting the saints and sages of that land; but none of the other biographers refers to any such expe-

[1] Hajji Beyrám is a celebrated saint and the Pír or spiritual chief of the Beyrámí dervish-order. He was born at a village near Angora, in which city he spent most part of his life, dying there in 833 (1429-30). He used, we are told, to supply his needs by the labour of his own hands, giving away in charity whatever was offered to him by the rich. Certain traducers having misrepresented him to Murád II, he was summoned to Adrianople, where the Sultan then was, when his gentle and holy demeanour so won the heart of the monarch that he implored his blessing. His tomb in Angora is still a place of pious visitation.

dition. Indeed, according to the Crimson Peony, after his studies with Hajji Beyrám, Sheykhí settled in a place near his native Kutahiya whence he never stirred during the rest of his life. Here too he died and was buried; and here his tomb was visited by the author Tash-köpri-záde who, as the reader may have observed, had a great fondness for visiting the last resting-places of learned and holy men. Assuming the account in the Crimson Peony to be correct (and its simplicity commends it), if there be any truth in Latífí's statement that Sheykhí made the acquaintance at Brusa of the gifted and intrepid poet Nesímí (of whom more in the next chapter), this must have occurred before the former settled down at Kutahiya.

According to Tash-köpri-záde, who quotes the authority of his teacher ᶜAlá-ud-Dín ᶜArebí, Sheykhí was mean-looking in person, and was moreover blear-eyed. In the latter connection the same author tells the following story, which has been copied by ᶜAshiq, Hasan and ᶜAlí. In order to eke out his living, Sheykhí, who was of great repute as a physician, and especially as an oculist, was in the habit of preparing a powder which he sold at a small price to those whose eyes were weak. One day a man of some intelligence and wit happened to pass by the place where the poet was dispensing his simples, and gathering from the inflamed state of the vender's own eyes that he was but 'throwing dust in the eyes' [1] of the people, he asked for an asper's worth of the powder, on receiving which he handed Sheykhí two aspers, saying sarcastically, 'Buy some of your powder with this second asper and annoint your own eyes therewith; it may be that through the grace of God they will be healed!'

[1] This expression represents both the literal and figurative senses of the analogous Turkish phrase used in the original: khalqiñ gözlerini boyardi, 'he was painting the eyes of the folk,' i. e. cheating them.

Sheykhí, it is added, was greatly pleased with the speaker's wit, and used always to laugh when he recalled the incident.

I have said that Sheykhí was famed for his skill in medicine; this is mentioned by all the biographers. Latífí even says that in his lifetime he was popularly known as Hekim Sinán or Doctor Sinán. Possibly the following anecdote, which first appears in ʿAshiq, may be to some extent the offspring of this side of the poet's reputation. Sultan Mehemmed the Debonair was lying grievously ill, and search was made far and near for a skilful physician. Sheykhí was found and brought before the royal patient, and when he had felt the Sultan's pulse and looked at his eyes, he said, 'The denser humours [1] have become mingled; the cure for this ill is an exceeding joy.' Just then a courier arrived bringing news of the capture of a great and well-nigh impregnable fortress, news which so delighted Mehemmed that he straightway began to regain his spirits, and day by day his health continued to improve till ere long it was quite restored. By way of rewarding the physician for his skill, the Sultan granted him as a fief a village called Doquzlar, [2] apparently

[1] The 'four humours' (akhlát-i erbaʿa) of the early physicians were choler i. e. bile (safra), phlegm (balgham), blood (dem) and melancholy (sevdá). The last of these, which was sometimes called 'atrabile' or 'black bile,' was an imaginary thick black fluid, supposed when in excess to be the cause of the feeling of depression which is still named from it 'melancholy.' Food was supposed to be converted into these four humours by a process of 'cooking' that went on in the liver. What answered to the froth on a pot of soup boiling on the fire, was changed into choler or bile; what corresponded to the half-cooked rice or vegetables floating on the surface, became phlegm; what represented the good wholesome soup itself, became blood; while what took the place of the sediment at the bottom of the pot, was turned into melancholy. Health was regarded as the result of the proper relationship of those humours to one another; and when this relationship was disturbed, disease ensued. By their relative proportions, moreover, a person's physical and mental qualities were held to be determined. This system, which is as old as Hippocrates, was maintained, even in the West, until the beginning of the eighteenth century. By the 'denser humours' the blood and the melancholy are meant.

[2] Some of the biographers call this village Doquzlu.

oblivious of the fact that this village was already the property of another. Be this as it may, as Sheykhí was travelling to his new possession, the original lord of Doquzlar fell upon him, plundered his baggage, slew his attendants, and left him lying wounded and half-dead upon the road. By and by, when he had recovered from his wounds, the poet embodied this adventure in a versified narrative which he named the Khar-Náme or 'Book of the Ass,' and in which he vigorously satirized his enemy. By means of this book the Sultan was made aware of what had occurred, whereupon he punished the author of the outrage and compelled him to indemnify Sheykhí for the loss he had sustained.

Such is the story told by ʿAshiq and repeated by Hasan and ʿAlí, a story not altogether easy to reconcile with Tash-köpri-záde's statement that Sheykhí never left the place near Kutahiya whither he retired on finishing his studies at Angora. Possibly a desire to account for the composition of the Khar-Náme may have had some influence in moulding the details of the narrative.

Concerning that poem ʿAlí tells us that as no one could be found willing to bring under the notice of the Sultan a work with so unseemly a title as 'The Book of the Ass,' an extra letter dál (d) was slipped in after the ri (r) which changed the name into Khired-Náme or 'The Book of Wisdom.' It is noteworthy that while there is no entry in Kátib Chelebi's lexicon under the title of Khar-Náme, among those under Khirad-Náme we find 'a Turkish poem by Mevláná Sheykhí of Germiyan who wrote it for Sultan Mehemmed the son of the Thunderbolt.'

Of this Khar-Náme or Khired-Náme I can give no account, as I have never seen a copy or come across any adequate description of its nature or contents. All I have been able to learn is from an anonymous note in the printed edition

of Latífí, where moreover a different account is given of the occasion of its composition. It is there said that when Sheykhí presented his poem of 'Khusrev and Shírín' to Sultan Murád, certain persons, jealous of the poet's skill, declared his work to be nothing more than a translation from Nizámí and therefore unworthy of praise or reward, whereupon Sheykhí wrote this Khar-Náme in which he satirizes those malevolent critics. This story would fit better with Tash-köpri-záde's statement that Sheykhí never quitted Kutahiya; but the difficulty in accepting it is that Sheykhí died before he had completed the Khusrev and Shírín, and it is not likely that he would present to the Sultan a work that was still in progress. In the same note are quoted fourteen couplets, the only extract from the work that I have seen. These describe a poor hungry ass, whose master, taking compassion on him, turns him out to graze in a rich pasture, where he sees many fat oxen regaling themselves. In the absence of the context it is impossible to say what this picture refers to; possibly Sheykhí is the poor lean ass whose master the Sultan would provide for him, while the fat oxen may represent his enemies.

Far more important than this satire is Sheykhí's long and beautiful romantic poem on the loves of Khusrev and Shírín. This work, by which alone the author is now remembered, was begun some time after the accession of Murád which took place in 824 (1421). The author unhappily died before he had quite finished the poem. The year of his death is unrecorded, but it cannot have been later than 855 (1451), that of the death of Sultan Murád, as that prince is eulogized as the reigning monarch in the brief epilogue wherein another writer tells us that Sheykhí is dead, having left his work unfinished. This other writer is said by ʿAshiq, Hasan and ʿAlí (the earlier biographers Latífí and Tash-köpri-záde are

silent on the subject) to have been Sheykhí's sister's son Jemálí; but in the epilogue he calls himself Báyezíd and says nothing whatever as to any relationship or connection between himself and the dead poet.[1]

The biographers are at one in declaring Sheykhí to have been a man of great learning. According to Latífí he was deeply versed alike in exoteric and esoteric lore, and most notably in the mystic philosophy; for although he never gave himself out as a teacher of Súfíism, he attained that lofty 'Station' on the mystic Journey where the saint, in ecstatic union with God, contemplates the Divine Essence free from any attribute conceived by thought. And should any doubt this assertion, Latífí refers him to the opening and closing cantos of the Khusrev and Shírín where the poet discourses on the Degrees in the Perception of the Unity[2] and on the Classes of the Epiphanies. Of the medical knowledge with which, as we have seen, the biographers credit Sheykhí, there is no evidence in his poem. Unlike Ahmedí, once he is fairly launched upon his story, he confines himself pretty closely to it. Apart from the opening cantos, which professedly deal with mystic matters, in one place only does the author make any display of his knowledge of science. This is in the very last pages that he lived to

[1] In a MS. of Sheykhí's Khusrev u Shírín transcribed in 919 (1513-4), in my collection, the rubric to the epilogue runs: اندر وفات کردن مؤلّف کتاب شیخی علیه الرحمه و تمام کردن کتابرا بایزید بن مصطفی بن شیخ احمد التّرجمانی الاقشهری 'Touching the Dying of the Author of the Book, Sheykhí (upon whom be mercy!), and the Completing of the Book by Báyezíd the son of Mustafa the son of Sheykh Ahmed the Interpreter of Aq-Shehr.'

Kátib Chelebi says that the Khusrev and Shírín was finished by Jemálí, Sheykhí's brother. It is possible that Báyezíd may have been the personal name and Jemálí the pen-name of the same individual.

[2] ʿIlm-i Tevhíd, see p. 166, n. 6.

write; here the sage Buzurg-Umíd is made, in answer to the inquiries of the King, to give an account of the creation through the medium of the Primal Intelligence, and to describe the work of the successive Emanations in ruling the planetary spheres, the elements and so on. In fact, this portion of the poem is practically a treatise on the theoretic philosophy of those days, a philosophy which, as we have seen, was accepted by most of the learned of the time, and held concurrently with Súfíism or with orthodox Islam, or, most usually, with a combination of both.

The recorded literary works of Sheykhí consist of the already-mentioned Khar-Náme (or Khired-Náme), a Díwán of lyric poems, and the famous mesneví of Khusrev and Shírín. Concerning the first of these, I can add to what I have already said only the fact that it is written neither in the familiar metre of the Iskender-Náme nor in that used by the author in his Khusrev and Shírín, but in an altogether new variety, that known as khafíf.[1] Likewise with the Díwán; I have never seen a copy, and from the few stray fragments quoted by the biographers, it is impossible to form any independent opinion as to its value. The authorities, however, are unanimous in declaring that the poet was much less successful with the ghazel than with the mesneví.

It is, as has been said, solely through the Khusrev and Shírín that Sheykhí occupies his prominent position in Turkish literature.[2] It is in this poem that grace of style and beauty of language are for the first time deliberately sought after in mesneví verse. Hitherto, whatever grace and beauty had been achieved had found expression in the lyric forms alone;

[1] See p. 109.

[2] The Khusrev u Shírín has not yet been published, but a few extracts from it will be found in the third volume of the Kharábát. The British Museum possesses three complete MSS. (Add. 7906: Or. 2708: Or. 3294.), and one imperfect (Add. 19, 451). There is a perfect copy in my collection.

while in such mesnevís as had been written, directness and simplicity, not elegance or curiosity, had been the qualities aimed at. That this beauty and refinement should have been sought for almost exclusively through the medium of the art of Bedí[c] or Euphuism is perhaps regrettable, but was of course inevitable. What is important to note, is that the step here taken by Sheykhí — the introduction into mesneví of the Persian euphuism which had already seized upon the lyric poetry — determined what was to be during two centuries the note of the Ottoman metrical romance.

The Khusrev and Shírín of Sheykhí is a fairly close translation of Nizámí's poem of the same name. The fact that it was such a translation did not militate against its success or popularity. For although the style was so far removed from the everyday speech that a just appreciation must have been impossible to those without some knowledge of Persian, it was a novelty to all to see the famous old romance in a Turkish dress.

The early Ottoman critics are at one in doing honour to the old poet who first of his countrymen essayed to present a story in literary guise. Latífí gratefully says that it is from him the poets of Rúm learned grace of style in mesneví, and that these have done no more therein than follow in his footsteps; while he adds that though many have endeavoured to 'parallel' the Khusrev and Shírín, none has succeeded in surpassing it. [c]Ashiq, while admitting that in matter it is little else than a translation, praises it for its strength and force and for the high level it maintains throughout. Comparing it with later famous Turkish romantic mesnevís, that writer declares that though Áhí's poem of the same name is full of grace and pith, and Hamdí's Joseph and Zelíkhá is clear and lucid, and Kemál-Pasha-záde's Joseph and Zelíkhá is artistic and ingenious, and Ja[c]fer Chelebi's

Heves-Náme is distinguished by eloquence, and the poems of Lámiʿí are brilliant and fluent, [1] Sheykhí's Khusrev and Shírín yet holds its own and is famous far and wide throughout the land. Hasan endorses the verdict of ʿAshiq. ʿAlí speaks of many of the lines from Sheykhí's poem as being household words, and quotes a passage describing an interview between the hero and heroine as an example of vivid representation. Sheykhí, it may be remarked, is with the exception of Suleymán Chelebí, the only poet of the First Period whom Ziyá Pasha mentions in the preface to his Anthology. The modern author, it is true, can see nothing in the old romancist except uncouthness of language; but the compiler of the Kharábát, though a remarkable and in some respects a highly gifted man, did not possess the critical faculty.

Looked at from our point of view, Sheykhí appears as an extremely skilful adapter. He saw that to completely and effectually graft the Persian system into the nascent literature of his people it was needful to bring the mesneví — so far the most important poetical form — into line with the qasída and ghazel. He thereupon took a story which he found ready to his hand, carefully studied the manner in which it had been dealt with by the Persian master, and set to work to reproduce this manner with all its peculiarities as closely as possible, using every effort to make his innovations blend harmoniously, always on the long-established lines, with the native material in which he was working.

The effect was revolutionary. All uncertainty as to which prosodial system should prevail disappears for ever. A studied grace of language and a laborious search for curiosity in idea and in expression, almost equal to what already was the rule in the lyric forms, replaces the more homely if ruder

[1] These poets all belong to the Second Period, and will claim our attention in due course.

vocabulary and the more direct though less ingenious phraseology of the earlier mesnevís. That the time was ripe for the change is clearly shown alike by the popularity which the work attained and by the fact that all subsequent mesnevís were modelled on the lines therein laid down. Whether the change thus accomplished by Sheykhí was to the real advantage of Turkish poetry is, however, open to serious question. It is true that thereby the cultivation of what we may call wit — of grace, refinement and ingenuity — was greatly fostered; but this was at the price of not only spontaneity and straightforwardness, but too often, it is to be feared, of sincerity. Naturalness was superseded by affectation.

But it would be unfair to blame the author for this; Sheykhí was before all things an artist, and no other path of art was open to him than that along which the force of circumstances was impelling his countrymen. In reality this poet deserves much praise; for it is he who first showed the Turks how to tell a story artistically. Ahmedí had not attempted this; his narrative, set forth in the baldest language and constantly interrupted by irrelevant digressions, has no pretensions to being a work of art; whereas Sheykhí was constrained by the same instinct that led him to shun the continual interruptions which destroy the unity of the Iskender-Náme, to make of his own book a thing of beauty by the employment of the choicest and most perfect forms of expression he could devise.

Sheykhí is consequently ahead of all previous writers of mesneví in matters of technique. He has no hesitation as to prosody, and with him halting lines are few and far between. One of his most noteworthy innovations is his adoption of a new metre. Hitherto all West-Turkish poems in mesneví form — the Rebáb-Náme of Veled, the Gharíb-Náme of ʿAshiq, the Mevlid of Suleymán, the Iskender-Náme of Ahmedí —

have been written in one and the same metre, the hexametric remel, that which had been chosen by Jelál-ud-Dín for his great work. Sheykhí for the first time breaks new ground, and writes his Khusrev and Shírín in a fresh measure, a hexametric variation of the hezej, [1] that of Nizámí's poem on the same theme. In so doing Sheykhí not only opened a wider field to the Turkish poets, he dealt a fatal blow to the supremacy of the old remel. Henceforward mesnevís are composed now in one metre now in another, as the fancy of the poet may determine; there is none that can claim universal favour, least of all that which in early times reigned undisputed.

Another of Sheykhí's innovations destined to take lasting root is the introduction of lyrics into the body of the mesneví. [2] These lyrics, which are almost always ghazels (there are four qasídas and one terjí'-bend in the Khusrev and Shírín), are generally presented as being sung by one or other of the actors in the romance in moments of excitement or exaltation. The idea of introducing such lyrics, which may be in any metre the poet pleases, is certainly a happy one, as they break to some extent the monotony of the mesneví in which line follows line through several thousand couplets without so much as the alteration of a single accent. That Sheykhí did not derive this idea from Nizámí whom as a rule he closely follows, is certain, for there are no such lyric interludes in the work of the great poet of Genje; but whether he adopted it from some other Persian writer or himself devised it, I cannot say. If he did devise it (which is the less likely alternative), he must have possessed a quite

[1] See p. 107.

[2] We have seen that in the episode of Gul-Sháh in the Iskender-Náme a number of ghazels are introduced into the mesneví; and this is one of the considerations which have inclined us to regard that episode as an interpolation.

unusual originality of which he has given no other evidence.[1]

It is important to note that with Sheykhí's Khusrev and Shírín the language of poetry definitively breaks away from the language of everyday life. All previous writers of mesneví (and all the important poetry had hitherto been in this form) had made use of a plain simple language such as everyone might understand and use. Sheykhí put an end to this. By devoting his exceptional talent to the work of introducing into the more serious form of poetry the artificial dialect of the lyric writers, who had so far been rather players and triflers with the art than its earnest cultivators, he did more than perhaps any other to the fixing of that great gulf between the language of literature and the speech of the people, which yawned ever wider with the centuries, and which has been partially bridged over only in our own day.

Sheykhí chose well when he selected the tale of Khusrev and Shírín as his theme; for the story of Shírín the Sweet is the prettiest and most interesting of the dozen or so legends that go to make up the repertory of the Eastern romantic poet. It may be called an historical romance, the hero, Khusrev-i Perviz, being the Sasanian King whom the Byzantines named Chosroes II. Nizámí, who first put the story into verse, drew most of his materials from the early historian Taberí,[2] to whom Sheykhí also had recourse when he wished to check or supplement the statements of his model. For the Turkish poet was no blind copyist; he did not hesitate to improve upon his predecessor when he

[1] The circumstance that the Jámesb-Náme, a contemporary romantic mesneví, contains, as we shall see in a later chapter, a number of ghazels similarly introduced, tells against the likelihood of Sheykhí's being the originator of this development.

[2] Taberí, who wrote in Arabic a very famous universal history, was born in the old Persian province of Taberistán in 224 (838-9), and died in Baghdad in 310 (922-3).

thought such an operation desirable. In two instances in particular did he depart from Nizámí's lead; the first of these is in the account of the rebellion of Behrám-i Chúbín, to which he devotes an entire dástán, whereas the Persian poet dismisses it in a chapter or two;[1] the second is in the prominence which he gives to Buzurg-Umíd's discourse concerning the creation of the universe and other recondite matters, a discourse which, though left unfinished, runs through several chapters and would probably have occupied a whole dástán, and which Nizámí rounds off in a few lines. Whether Sheykhí was well advised in the introduction of this additional matter admits of question. With regard to the Behrám incident, it may be pleaded that this gives more completeness to the story; but it is in no wise essential to the development of the plot; while the lecture of the sage is only too much after the fashion of Ahmedí. Both additions are in themselves interesting; but by distracting the attention of the reader, they are hurtful to the unity of the poem, and in introducing them, Sheykhí, departing from his wont, allowed the scholar to prevail over the artist.

The story of Khusrev and Shírín was dealt with by several subsequent Turkish poets, among the best known being Jelílí and Áhí, both of whom flourished somewhere about a century later.[2] But none of these more recent poems ever achieved anything like the popularity won and retained by this earliest of all, the quaint old Germiyan Turkish of which, with its long-obsolete words and forms, seems to harmonize

[1] Sheykhí distinctly says that Nizámí who tells the story (of Khusrev and Shírín) does not inform us of the events which led up to this revolt, but that he, having found them in history books, will give them in detail.

[2] Kátib Chelebi cites further two poets whom he calls respectively Khalífa and Muʿídí-záde as having composed mesnevís on this subject. I am unable to identify the first; the second is probably the Muʿídí mentioned by Latífí as a contemporary of his own and as having written a 'Response' to Nizámí's Quintet.

well with the old-world story of the gallant King and the brave and lovely Princess.

Had it been completed, the book would no doubt have consisted of the customary three divisions: Prologue, Subject and Epilogue. As it is, we have only the first of these and a part (though a large part) of the second. This was never finished; the brief epilogue added by another hand merely announces the death of the poet and winds up with some common-place lines eulogizing the reigning Sultan. No date of composition is anywhere mentioned; but as the panegyrics both in the prologue and the epilogue speak of Murád II as the occupant of the throne, the poem was most likely written during his reign which, as already said, extended from 824 (1421) to 855 (1451).[1]

The prologue consists, as is usual, of a number of cantos dealing with religious subjects, including the expositions of certain Súfiistic technicalities praised so highly by Latífí. In the midst of these is a qasída concerning a couplet in which the biographer Riyází tells this story.[2] One day the famous Sheykh Aq Shems-ud-Dín, a contemporary of Mehemmed the Conqueror, and the father of the well-known poet Hamdí, was seated amid his pupils; but instead of discoursing to them as usual, he appeared to be absorbed in contemplation and oblivious to all around, only uttering from time to time the words 'O Germiyan! O Germiyan!' Those present were bewildered at his conduct till at length he said to them, 'I behold in my vision the Heavenly Host, and they dervish-dancing, and the words of their litany are these lines of Sheykhí of Germiyan: —

[1] Both ʿAshiq and ʿAlí say that Sheykhí began his Khusrev and Shírín during Murád's reign; Hasan says it was undertaken at that monarch's command.

[2] Von Hammer says that this story is told also by Sehí.

Ne'er may Reason yield us tidings of Thy Godhead's caravan;
Only soft unto the Soul's ear is there borne a chime of bells.' [1]

The religious and mystic cantos are followed by that 'Touching the Reason of the Writing of the Book.' In this Sheykhí says that one day when sorrow was bearing him company, his Hátif-i Ján or 'Inward Monitor' addressed him, asking why he is thus sick at heart, and bidding him be up and doing, for it may be truly said of him whose name lives on in the world that he never dies; and he himself may win such immortality, for the gift of poetry has been bestowed on him. He is then exhorted to write a mesneví; for, he is told, that though he may be strong in the ghazel, yet it is the mesneví which is the touchstone of the coin of eloquence. The poet seeks to excuse himself, partly on the score of his lack of ability, but chiefly because the people of his day have no taste or discernment in things literary, and that to write for them were labour in vain. But the Inward Monitor rejects these excuses, telling him that it matters not though he see none about him to appreciate his work, for his verses will take wing and fly to those who know their value; and bidding him in the meantime hope for grace from God and for help from the enlightened patronage of the Sultan, on whose name he is commanded to build his work. This is followed by two cantos and a qasída in honour of Sultan Murád, which bring the prologue to a close.

The poet then enters on his proper subject, the story of

[1] کبریاکوك کاربانندن خبر ویرمز عقول
ایرمز اندن جان قولاغینه مکر بانك جرس

The beasts in a caravan wear bells, and thus the caravan may sometimes be heard passing even when it is out of sight.

The idea in the verse is that reason is powerless to tell aught concerning the Godhead, and that even the soul is aware of Its existence only through the phenomena of which it is conscious.

Khusrev and Shírín. Of this we have nine complete Books, called as usual Dástáns or 'Legends,' and one unfinished. These carry the narrative down to the nuptials of the hero and heroine, and, as little except the final catastrophe remains to tell, it is unlikely that even had the life of the author been prolonged, the poem would have contained more than eleven or twelve of such Books.

The epilogue, which consists of just over a hundred couplets, is divided into two cantos, the first announcing the death of Sheykhí, the second devoted to the praises of Sultan Murád. It is, as we have seen, the work of a writer who calls himself Báyezíd, but whom the biographers call Jemálí.

Here is an outline of the story of Khusrev and Shírín as told by Sheykhí: — [1]

Khusrev-i Pervíz, the son of King Hurmuz of Persia, is educated by the sage Buzurg-Umíd (Great Hope), and grows up an accomplished and valiant prince. The King, full of gratitude to Heaven for his gallant son, determines to rule with yet greater justice than before, and issues a proclamation that whosoever wrongs his neighbour shall be visited with condign punishment. One day, when Hurmuz is seated giving judgment, some villagers come into his presence and complain that last evening, when returning from one of his frequent hunting expeditions, the Prince had entered their village and caroused all night in one of their houses to the music of his minstrel; furthermore, that his horse had broken loose and trampled down a poor man's corn, while one of his slaves had entered a garden and stolen some unripe grapes. Hurmuz is enraged at his son's

[1] Khusrev-i Pervíz (Chosroes II) was the son of Hurmuz IV (Hormisdas IV) and grandson of the great Núshírewán (Chosroes I). Having in A. D. 591 defeated the rebel Behrám-i Chúbín (Varanes VI) who had usurped the throne on the death of Hurmuz in 590, he reigned over the Persian Empire till A. D. 628, when he was murdered by his son Shírúya (Siroes).

conduct; he orders the horse to be given to the owner of the corn, the slave to the proprietor of the garden, and the Prince's trappings and accoutrements to the man in whose house he passed the night. He is further about to condemn his son, but on the intercession of the nobles pardons him on his confessing his misdemeanour. Shortly after this, Khusrev sees in a vision his grandsire Núshírewán who tells him that since at his father's bidding he has cheerfully given up his minstrel and his horse, his slave and his accoutrements, he shall get for the first a singer sweeter yet, whose name shall be Bárbud, for the second a steed called Shebdíz, [1] fleeter than the thought of man, for the third an all-lovely mistress whose name shall be Shírín, [2] and for the last the glorious throne Táqdís.

One day not long after this a friend of Khusrev's, Sháwúr [3] by name, a cunning artist and a great traveller, tells the Prince, in course of a conversation, that in his wanderings he has passed through a charming country called Armenia, which is governed by a great queen, Mehín [4] Bánú, who is famous among the monarchs of Christendom. The heir of this princess is her niece the lovely Shírín, a peerless beauty, of whose heavenly charms Sháwúr treats Pervíz to a glowing description. This enchanting lady is given to roaming the country at the head of three hundred fair maidens, engaged in long picnic parties and hunting expeditions. Mehín Bánú has further a matchless steed, night-black in hue, and Shebdíz by name. Khusrev is struck by the identity of the names in Sháwúr's story with those in his dream; and having fallen in love with Shírín from his friend's account of her, he sends

[1] Shebdíz, i. e. 'Night-hued,' Khusrev's coal-black charger is the Horse Bayard of Eastern romance.

[2] The name Shírín, which means 'Sweet,' might be translated as 'Dulcinea.'

[3] Sheykhí always writes Sháwúr, but Shápúr (Sapor) is the more usual form.

[4] This name is so pointed in the MS. but it ought perhaps to be Mihín.

that friend off to Armenia to try to arrange matters there. Sháwúr arrives at a monastery in Armenia where he learns that Shírín and her maids are expected immediately to bivouac in a meadow hard by. The Persian accordingly paints a portrait of Khusrev which he hangs on a tree in a place where Shírín will see it, and then hides himself. Shírín and her maids arrive, she finds the picture, is greatly impressed by the beauty it portrays, weeping over it and kissing it. Her maidens seeing how deeply the picture affects her, manage to get hold of it, and secretly tear it up; they tell her that the demon who displayed it has hidden it, and persuade her to leave the place as it is haunted. Sháwúr, who has seen and heard all, is before them, and hangs up another similar picture in the place whither they are going. The same thing happens over again; and Sháwúr hangs up a third picture in the third place. This time Shírín keeps the picture, and sends her maids to look whether anyone is hiding near. Sháwúr, thinking it time to disclose himself, comes forward disguised as a priest; and after getting Shírín to make her attendants retire, he tells her that the pictures were painted by himself and represent Prince Khusrev-i Pervíz, whose praises he extols, and who, he goes on to say, is deeply in love with her, and sends her as token a ring, which Sháwúr hands to her. Shírín replies confessing her love for Khusrev, and praying to be directed to Medá'in the Persian capital. Sháwúr, having directed her, departs; and she and her maidens return to Mehín Bánú, and that very night she prevails upon her aunt to lend her Shebdíz to go a-hunting on the morrow. So next morning she arms herself, mounts the night-black steed, and sets out with her maids. Pretending to chase a deer, she easily makes her escape from the maidens, none of whose horses can come near Shebdíz. So after vainly seeking for their mistress, the girls return to Mehín, who is

sadly grieved at Shírín's disappearance. That lady, after riding for seven days, feels tired and dismounts to rest. She commends herself to God and then falls asleep, but is soon awakened by Shebdíz neighing, when she sees a lion approaching, which she kills with an arrow. Going on, she reaches a meadow in the midst of which is a fair pond in which she determines to bathe, being tired and dust-stained from her journey. She accordingly ties up her arms on Shebdíz, makes him fast to a tree, and having stripped, binds a blue cloth about her waist, and descends into the stream.

In the meantime, certain persons at Medá'in, jealous of Khusrev, have accused him before the King of intriguing to usurp the throne. Hurmuz, who is of a suspicious nature, having given ear to them, the Prince, by the advice of his old tutor Buzurg-Umíd, leaves the capital for a season. Before starting, Khusrev, who is half-expecting Shírín in consequence of Sháwúr's mission, tells the slave-girls at his splendid palace of Mushkú [1] that possibly a fair lady may arrive as his guest, and charges them, in case she does, to receive her with all honour and respect. He then sets out for Armenia, attended by a few followers, purposing to employ the time of his exile in prosecuting his love-suit. They halt by the way, when Khusrev, wandering about by himself, suddenly comes upon a black horse tied to a tree, and hard by, a beautiful girl bathing in a pond. She does not see him at first, and he gazes at her bewildered by her loveliness; but when she turns round and he perceives her confusion at being discovered thus, he modestly retires, whereupon Shírín (for it is she though Khusrev knows it not) springs out of the pond, seizes her clothes, leaps upon Shebdíz, and is off.

[1] Mushkú or Mushkúy, the private palace of Khusrev, perhaps represents that of Dastagherd, though the poets place the former within the city of Medá'in, while the latter was some seventy miles north of Ctesiphon.

None the less the beauty is troubled in mind by the vision of the fair young Prince, and continues her journey with a heart ill at ease, vaguely surmising that he may have been Khusrev. At length she reaches Medá'in, goes to the palace of Mushkú as Sháwúr had instructed her, where she is honourably entertained on presenting Khusrev's ring. When she learns that the Prince is gone, she does not care to remain in Mushkú; and as Pervíz had left orders that all her wishes were to be carried out, a castle [1] is built for her at her request among the hills.

Meanwhile, Khusrev, no less agitated in mind than Shírín, and like her haunted with an idea that he has seen the fair object of his quest, proceeds to Armenia and becomes the guest of Mehín Bánú, who tells him of her niece's disappearance, and invites him to winter there. Ere long Sháwúr arrives and tells the Prince all he has done. Khusrev informs Mehín of his friend's arrival with news of Shírín, and they resolve to send him off to Medá'in to fetch the beauty back, the Queen mounting him on Gulgún, [2] another wonderful steed in her possession, which is reckoned well-nigh the equal of Shebdíz. When Sháwúr reaches the Persian capital he is informed that Shírín has retired to her Castle; he goes there, tells the lady all that has happened, and persuades her to return to Armenia where Khusrev is. She accordingly mounts Gulgún, having left Shebdíz at Medá'in, and sets off accompanied by Sháwúr.

[1] This castle, Qasr-í Shírín or 'Castle-Shírín,' gives its name to a little town which in all probability occupies the traditional site of the famous beauty's residence; it is within the limits of modern Persia, about twenty miles across the Turkish frontier on the way to Kermánsháh.

[2] Gulgún, or 'Rose-hued' (i. e. Bay), is almost as famous as Shebdíz himself. The legend runs that both these horses were the offspring of a mare by the enchanted figure of a stallion sculptured out of a black rock in a certain cave in a mountain in Armenia.

In the meantime a messenger from Medá'in comes to Armenia and tells Khusrev that a revolution has broken out in the Persian capital, and that his father, who had been seized and blinded by the rebels, has resigned the crown in his favour. Sheykhí now proceeds to tell how this has come about. Hurmuz, though just, was severe, and many of the nobles and the people had revolted against him. The Cæsar, the Arabs, and the Kháqán of Tartary had made common cause with the rebels, but Hurmuz had bought off the Cæsar and the Arabs, and had sent his famous general Behrám-i Chúbín [1] to fight Sáya Khan the Tartar Kháqán. Behrám had defeated and slain that monarch who was the maternal uncle of Hurmuz, the latter's mother having been Sáya's sister. The Persian sovereign was thereupon seized with an unreasoning fit of anger against his general, and incited by certain evil-disposed persons about the court, he had sent that officer an insulting letter and a woman's dress. On this Behrám had renounced his allegiance to Hurmuz and given out that it was his intention to place Khusrev on the throne. The nobles of Medá'in having heard of this, and being weary of the severity of Hurmuz, had seized and blinded him, and sent off to Khusrev bidding him come and sit in his place. When he hears all this, Khusrev returns at once to his capital, where he is crowned king. He is told of Shírín's departure with Sháwúr, and is presented with Shebdíz. It soon becomes evident that Behrám's real purpose is to secure the throne for himself; and as he is stronger than Khusrev, the latter, acting on Buzurg-Umíd's advice, retires from the country for a year, till his star shall be in the ascendant.

Sháwúr has now taken Shírín back to Armenia, only to

[1] Behrám-i Chúbín, i. e. 'Behrám the Stick-like,' so called because of his leanness and his withered up appearance, is the Varanes VI of the Byzantines.

find Khusrev gone. Not long after, however, when out hunting with her maidens, Shírín meets Khusrev who is on his way to Armenia. They recognise one another, and in great delight go together to Mehín Bánú who receives them with all kindness. Mehín takes an opportunity of earnestly entreating her niece to be circumspect and in every case jealously to guard her honour, which Shírín solemnly swears to do. Khusrev and she then go out into the country with their respective suites, and after a month spent in hunting and polo and other amusements, the King invites the beauty to an entertainment in his camp. They have a fair banquet and concert where Bárbud, Khusrev's musician, sings some ghazels interpreting the emotions of his master's heart, to which Nigísá, Shírín's minstrel-maid, replies on behalf of her fair mistress. This, it may be noted in passing, is a feature of the story; Bárbud and Nigísá are continually acting as the mouthpieces of Khusrev and Shírín respectively. The party proceeds to the banks of the River Aras (Araxes) where they have another feast and another concert, and where Khusrev kills a lion with a blow of his fist; and here the King and the Princess do a little love-making. And so they pass a long time in all delight, hunting and feasting, till one night Khusrev forgets himself and tries to tempt Shírín; but she, mindful of her promise to her aunt, resists him, and by her bold words makes him resolve to win back his ancestral throne.

He accordingly departs next morning, but has not gone far ere he bitterly regrets having left his fair friend. Still he determines to go on, and makes his way into the land of Rúm, where he comes upon a great monastery to which he goes up alone. He is refused admission, but the voice of Nestor, a wise and learned monk, tells him who he is and what he seeks, and prophesies that in eighteen months he will attain all his desires. Khusrev then goes on to the Cæsar

(Maurice), who receives him well, makes him marry his daughter Meryem (Maria), and supplies him with troops by whose aid he fights and overcomes Behrám who flies to the King of China. Khusrev accordingly reascends the throne of his fathers, and rules with justice; but despite his success, he is sad, mourning the absence of Shírín. She, on her part, is disconcerted when she discovers that Khusrev has really left the camp, and returns to her aunt who does her best to comfort her. Not long after this the good Mehín Bánú dies, and Shírín reigns in her stead; but she still grieves for Khusrev, and is sadly vexed when she hears that he is married to Meryem. However, accompanied by a large retinue in which is the faithful Sháwúr, who has never left her, she starts for Persia, and reaches her Castle among the mountains. She sends Sháwúr thence to Medá'in, considerately telling him not to mention her to Khusrev lest it should annoy him now that he is married. But Sháwúr does not heed this; he finds the King, who has just heard of the death of Behrám, and rejoices him with the news of Shírín's presence, and then returns to the Castle.

We are now introduced to one of the most famous characters in Eastern romance. Shírín in her Castle is unable to get any milk, as the pasture-lands and the herds are far away on the other side of the mountain, and on her complaining of this one day in the presence of Sháwúr, the latter tells her of a talented fellow-student of his, named Ferhád, who will, he thinks, be able to arrange some means to gratify her wish. He accordingly goes and fetches Ferhád, who no sooner looks upon Shírín than he is smitten to the heart for love of her. She tells him her wishes, but he is too dazed to understand her, and his friends have to explain to him what she has said. He then sets to work with a will, and within a month digs a canal through the mountain from

the pasture-land to the Castle; into this canal the shepherds milk their animals, and thus Shírín is provided with a constant supply of fresh milk. When the beauty sees this she is filled with admiration and praises the work as more than human; she offers Ferhád gold and jewels; but he, distraught by love of her, takes nothing, and flies into the desert where he wanders about like a maniac. Khusrev, hearing of this, sends messengers to fetch Ferhád; one of these finds him and brings him before the King, who tries him with offers of riches and threats of punishment; but seeing all such to be in vain, he promises to give him Shírín if he will cut a road through the great mountain Bí-Sitún.[1] Ferhád at once agrees; but before beginning to cut through the mountain, he carves in the rock figures of Shírín and of Khusrev and Shebdíz,[2] to the first of which he often speaks and makes his moan during the progress of his labours. On learning this, Shírín is much affected and determines to go to Bí-Sitún and try to comfort him. The sculptor is dumbfoundered when he sees her, but a draught which she gives him restores him to his senses, and he declares to her his sad case. Shírín bids him farewell; but as she is going down the hill, her

[1] Kúh-i Bí-Sitún, i. e. 'Mount Pierless,' is a huge rock about twenty miles north of Kermánsháh; in one place it is cut to a smooth perpendicular surface and projects over the road like a canopy, whence the name Bí-Sitún, literally, 'Without Columns.' This is said to be the remains of Ferhád's work, and it has earned for him the sobriquet of Kúh-ken, or 'Mountain-hewer,' by which the poets often allude to him.

[2] The Táq-i Bustán or 'Garden Arch,' represents this work of Ferhád's. It is an archway or grotto cut out in a rock near Kermánsháh, on the brink of a clear pool. In the spandrels are beautifully executed figures of flying angels holding the Sasanian diadem. Within the recess, the two sides and the farther end are decorated with bas-reliefs; those at the sides represent Khusrev hunting, while those at the end, in two lines, one above the other, show, above, Khusrev between two figures, one male (Ferhád) and one female (Shírín), and below, the King in full armour mounted on Shebdíz; this last figure, as well as one of the angels, has been much damaged.

horse stumbles, which Ferhád sees, and rushing forward, he saves her from falling and escorts her back to her Castle. Khusrev, having got word of these doings and also of Ferhád's having well-nigh accomplished his almost superhuman task, is filled with anger, and consults with his vezirs how to escape from his promise. By the advice of those ministers, he sends an old woman to Ferhád with the false information that Shírín is dead. When the devoted lover hears that his dear one has passed away, he feels that life is no longer possible for him, and throwing himself down from a high rock, meets the death he seeks. When Shírín is told of this she grieves deeply and orders a dome to be built over Ferhád's grave on the spot where he died, to be a shrine for lovers for ever more.

This episode of Ferhád causes a misunderstanding between Khusrev and Shírín, which it takes a considerable time and all the ingenuity of Sháwúr to remove. Meanwhile Meryem, Khusrev's wife, dies, but Shírín refuses his advances, being annoyed alike at his marriage and at his conduct with regard to Ferhád. Khusrev accordingly solaces himself for a time with a fair lady named Sheker or 'Sugar,' of whose society, however, he soon tires and yearns as before for the peerless Shírín. That lady, on her part, begins to regret her harshness, and consents to receive Khusrev who has come from Medá'in to her Castle, nominally on a hunting expedition. After upbraiding him for his faithlessness, she dismisses him, and he returns sadly to his camp where Sháwúr tries to console him. Shírín again regrets her conduct, slips out of the Castle disguised as one of the King's attendants, and makes for the camp. There she is met by Sháwúr who recognises her, and at her request hides her in a pavilion, in which he induces Khusrev to hold a banquet. Nigísá, whom Shírín had presented to Khusrev on the Aras, is let into the secret,

and at the feast she sings to the King as from Shírín; Bárbud replies in an affecting strain, whereupon Shírín betrays her presence by a deep sigh. Sháwúr then pulls back the curtain, and Khusrev and Shírín are in each other's presence. They soon arrange their marriage, which is shortly afterwards celebrated at Medá'in with great pomp. Nigísá is at the same time married to Bárbud, and Humáyún, Shírín's favourite damsel, to Sháwúr, who is made King of Armenia. Khusrev now leads a happy life with his beloved Shírín, until one day he sees a grey hair in his beard, which makes him think how all this must have an end. He speaks about this to Buzurg-Umíd who proceeds to tell him of the creation of the universe and of the nature of things.

And here, in the middle of the sage's discourse, Sheykhí's narrative breaks off.

The conclusion of the story can be supplied from Nizámí, and is soon told. Khusrev is comforted and edified by the words of Buzurg-Umíd, but he suffers much anxiety from the undutiful and seditious spirit of Shírúya, his son by Meryem the Greek princess. This youth, having become enamoured of Shírín, resolves to murder his father, and so secure at once the throne and his mistress. One night, when Shírín, having lulled Khusrev to sleep, has fallen asleep herself, worn out by vague forebodings that have been preying on her mind, an assassin, the emissary of Shírúya, steals into the room, creeps up to the couch, plunges a dagger into Khusrev's breast, and flies. The King, waking, finds himself covered with blood and wounded to the death. Intensely thirsty, his first thought is to rouse Shírín and get her to bring him some water, but then remembering that she has not slept for some nights, and knowing she will need all her strength for the morrow, he nobly resolves to let her sleep on, and so dies in his anguish. By and by Shírín

awakes, and when she realises what has happened, she weeps as though her heart would break; but knowing that she has yet somewhat to do, she calms herself as best she may. She then washes and annoints the body of the King; and she has scarce finished this task when Shírúya sends her a secret message declaring his love. To gain her ends she feigns acquiescence, and gets him to destroy the private residence and personal property of Khusrev, she being unable to endure the thought that those things so associated with their mutual happiness should pass into the murderer's hands. She then causes a magnificent bier to be made; and the body of Khusrev is borne in great state to the mausoleum, Buzurg-Umíd and Bárbud and all the grandees of the empire marching in the procession. Shírín herself, magnificently arrayed and wearing her splendid jewels, walks in the midst of a troop of youths and maidens, with so glad a mien that Shírúya believes her to be rejoicing in his love. On reaching the mausoleum, the procession draws up outside, the bier is carried in, and Shírín follows to watch by it. When the door is closed, Shírín goes up to the bier, uncovers the King's breast, kisses the wound, and thrusts a dagger into the same spot in her own body. She then throws her arms about the dead King, lays her cheek to his, and uttering one loud cry which is heard by those outside, she dies.

The following passage is from the Introduction to the Khusrev and Shírín; in it the poet speaks of the Tevhíd, that knowledge or perception of the underlying Unity of all things which is so dear to the Eastern mystic. As we have no single word in English to express this idea, I have in the translation represented it by the phrase 'Ken of Unity.' This is one of the passages to which Latífí refers as showing Sheykhí's intimacy with the Súfí mysteries.

From the Khusrev u Shírín. [49]

Concerning the Degrees in the Ken of Unity.

Come, heart, if thou the loftiest aim desire,
Know, soul, if thou the Utmost Goal [1] enquire,
That Ken of Unity the loftiest is,
The utmost limit of all saintship this.
Each sect hath told, far as its wit hath seen,
As far as hath its sight had power to win,
Of this full many a hint half-understood,
By some as Taste, [2] by some as Knowledge, [3] viewed.
Yet to the Truth of Ken of Unity
The Path leads not the traveller-company; [4]
For that an Ocean is that hath no bound,
And none may that encompass or surround.
What they whose lore and reason perfect be
Have reached is but the shore of yonder Sea!
Of Irem-garth [5] how should the leaflet know?

[1] Maqsad-i Aqsa, 'the Utmost (or Farthest) Goal,' is a favourite Súfí phrase

[2] When the perception of the Unity is attained, not through reason, but through intuition. Zevq, 'Taste,' is the term applied by the Súfís to the intuitive faculty which enables the mystic to discern between true and false without his having recourse to books or other external sources of information.

[3] When the perception of the Unity is attained, not through intuition, but through reason.

[4] Even the Súfí Path cannot lead the mystic to that last degree in the perception of the Unity, which is called the Truth; for this is accessible to the One alone.

[5] It is related that Sheddád, an ancient Arab King of the tribe of ᶜÁd, laid out in the desert of ᶜAden a terrestrial paradise in rivalry of the celestial. Of this magnificent garden of palaces, which is called Irem, many stories are told, such as that it contained 300,000 pavilions each adorned with 1,000 pillars of jasper bound with gold. But Sheddád never enjoyed his splendid work; for as he was about to enter the glorious garden-city, he and all his host were struck dead by a cry from Heaven. The terrestrial paradise disappeared from sight; but it still stands invisible in the desert of ᶜAden where from time to time God permits a traveller to see it. Sir Richard Burton says that he once met an Arab who declared that he had seen this city on the borders of a waste of deep sands called Al-Ahkáf to the west of Hadramaut. Sir R. Burton believes that what the man really saw was the mirage. Irem

Or how the mote the sun's vast body show?
On high His Glory over all their speech!
Aloft His Essence over all they teach!
The wonder this, the more it is revealed
The more the nature of The Truth 's concealed.
Its radiance is a veil, and so its light,
The more it waxeth, hides it more from sight. [1]
But they of the Unveilment [2] thence have brought
From time to time a hint to such as sought,
A hint the soul-perceivéd taste whereof
To ecstasy upraiseth them of Love.
As theirs who relativity deny: —
'To drop relation 's Ken of Unity.' [3]
Or his who far upon this Path hath gone: —
'Phenomenal maketh Eternal known.' [4]
Saith who divides 'tween true and vain withal: — [5]
'Outside is God of aught phenomenal.
'What 's proved as upshot of the whole is this: —
'Outside phenomena their Maker is.' [6]

is mentioned in the Koran, lxxxix, 6, where it is called 'Irem the Many-Columned,' whence probably the tale of the jasper pillars. It is often alluded to by the poets as the type sometimes of a magnificent garden, sometimes of a splendid palace.

[1] The nearer it approaches to the Godhead, the more is the eye of the understanding dazzled, and so the less it can see. The effulgence of the Godhead may thus be described as a veil concealing it from sight. See p. 66.

[2] 'They of the Unveilment (Keshf),' i. e. the prophets and saints from before whose souls the veil woven by the senses is from time to time withdrawn. See pp. 58-9.

[3] The mystics who deny the real existence of relativity say that the perception of the Unity is accomplished through rejecting all conceptions of relationship, such as creator and created, cause and effect, possessor and possessed, etc. When one has discovered all relationship to be illusion, one perceives the Unity.

[4] Things are known through their opposites (see p. 17); thus it is through the phenomenal we gain the conception of the eternal.

[5] i. e. the ordinary non-mystic, non-philosophic person who draws a hard and fast line between the spiritual and the material, the creator and the created, the eternal and the phenomenal, and so on.

[6] Such an one says: After all your arguments, the only rational conclusion is that the Creator is outside and separate from the phenomena which He creates.

His Beauty 's one, though manifold their speech;
To yonder Beauty 'tis that pointeth each.
Division in the Ken of Unity
Is not, yet thus they of philosophy: —
In Ken of Unity are three degrees;
And Knowledge, Eye, and Truth, the names of these.
On reason founded doth the Knowledge lie;
And 'tis through intuition comes the Eye.
The Truth is proper to the One for e'er;
Nor reason wins, nor intuition, there. [1]

The remaining translations are all from the story itself. The reader will observe how much more figurative Sheykhí's style is than that of any of his predecessors in mesneví; in particular how lavish he is in the use of metaphor.

From the Khusrev u Shírín. [50]

Khusrev-i Pervíz discovereth Shírín bathing in the Pond.

The spot whereat the Prince Pervíz did light
Was where yon Moon [2] was bathing in delight;
E'en then whenas the sugar-dulce Shírín,
Like Moon in Watery Sign, [3] did lave amene.

[1] This division of the perception of the Unity into three degrees (ʿIlm-i Tevhíd, ʿAyn-i Tevhíd, Haqq-i Tevhíd) is copied from the well-known threefold division of Certainty or Certain Knowledge, i. e. (1) 'the Knowledge of Certainty' (ʿIlm-i Yaqín); (2) 'the Eye of Certainty' (ʿAyn-i Yaqín); (3) 'the Truth of Certainty' (Haqq-i Yaqín). These three degrees of certain knowledge are thus illustrated: — the knowledge which each man has concerning death is the Knowledge of Certainty; when the man sees the Angel of Death approach, this knowledge becomes the Eye of Certainty; and when he actually tastes of death, it becomes the Truth of Certainty.

[2] 'Yon Moon' i. e. Shírín. 'Moon' is a constant term for a beauty in Eastern poetry.

[3] The astrologers divided the Signs of the Zodiac into four 'Triplicities' (Musellesát): (1) Aries, Leo and Sagittary were fiery, hot, dry, male and day signs; (2) Taurus, Virgo and Capricorn were earthy, cold, dry, female and night signs; (3) Gemini, Libra and Aquarius were airy, hot, moist, male

And pacing on, he gains that meadow-land,
And casts his glance around on every hand.
He sees a flowery plain like Eden-close,
A stream which e'en as Kevser-river flows.
Among the treen is bound a black destrier,
(Y-brent with envy were that steed the Sphere!)
A charger such, the Monarch bright of blee
Had ne'er bestridden steed so fair as he.
Advancing softly, sudden did he sight
That Moon within the water shining bright.
And what a Moon! the world-illuming sun
Would gain in glore if 'neath her shade he won.
From mid the fount effulgence flasheth forth;
The fount laves her, she laves in light the earth.

and day signs; (4) Çancer, Scorpio and Pisces were watery, cold, moist, female and night signs.

Each of the Zodiacal Signs was said to be the 'house' (beyt) of one or other of the Seven Planets (see p. 43). Each planet, except the Sun and Moon which had only one apiece, had two of such 'houses.' The sign opposite a planet's 'house' was called its 'fall' (vebál). Each planet had further what was known as its 'exaltation' or 'honour' (sheref) in another sign; and its 'dejection' (hubút) in that opposite. When in its own 'house,' a planet was supposed to possess more than usual influence; when in its 'exaltation,' it was in the position of its greatest power. The following table shows the 'houses,' 'falls,' 'exaltation,' and 'dejection' of each planet.

Sign of the Zodiac:	House of:	Fall of:	Exaltation of:	Dejection of:
Aries.	Mars.	Venus.	Sun.	Saturn.
Taurus.	Venus.	Mars.	Moon.	
Gemini.	Mercury.	Jupiter.		
Cancer.	Moon.	Saturn.	Jupiter.	Mars.
Leo.	Sun.	Saturn.		
Virgo.	Mercury.	Jupiter.	Mercury.	Venus.
Libra.	Venus.	Mars.	Saturn.	Sun.
Scorpio.	Mars.	Venus.		Moon.
Sagittary.	Jupiter.	Mercury.		
Capricorn.	Saturn.	Moon.	Mars.	Jupiter.
Aquarius.	Saturn.	Sun.		
Pisces.	Jupiter.	Mercury.	Venus.	Mercury.

The idea in Sheykhí's verse is that the effect produced on the beholder by the sight of the Moon-like (i. e. beautiful) Shírín in the water was baleful as the influence of the Moon when in its 'dejection,' the Watery Sign, Scorpio.

The violets spread in clusters o'er the rose,
The comb-teeth did the hyancinths dispose. [1]
Her body made the pond a treasure-scryne, [2]
O'er which she'd loosed her locks to twist and twine. [3]
Her hand had pushed those writhing snakes away,
As saying: 'Hence! A charm here holdeth sway!' [4]
For raving wildly when it saw her ear
She'd bound the water with her curling hair;
As frenzied 'twas and furious of spright,
She'd bound it, nay, had chained it, fettered tight. [5]
When o'er her crystal [6] frame was sprent the spray:
'The moonlight through a pearl-gemmed veil,' thou'dst say. [7]
When shone that Moon before the Prince's gaze,
The Prince became the sun — with fire ablaze.
The tears like rain pour down from both his eyne;
For lo, behold the Moon in Watery Sign!
Astound, he might not leave nor yet might stay,

[1] The violets and the hyacinths are the lady's tresses, the rose is her face She was sitting in the water combing her hair, — like the mermaid in old prints.

[2] Her body being the jewel or treasure, and the pond the casket which contained it.

[3] Like snakes. The widely spread myth of a snake or dragon guarding a treasure is as familiar to the East as to the West, and has given the poets occasion for countless conceits and fancies, the most favourite of which is perhaps the comparison thereto of a beauty's curls hanging about her fair face.

[4] She pushes aside the long locks floating about her, — which suggests to the poet that her body is like a structure guarded against snakes by some talisman similar to that which Alexander set up in his capital to keep it free from such creatures (p. 278).

[5] The comparison of the curling locks of a beauty to chains (generally to bind her lover's heart) is very common.

In these two couplets the rushing water is conceived as having gone mad through love of her, and so as having been chained as madmen often are in the East.

[6] A clear white skin is often described as 'crystal.'

[7] In this couplet the lady is supposed to be throwing handfuls of water over her body, when her white and shining skin, seen between the drops of water thus thrown, is conceived as the bright moonlight seen through the interstices of one of those Eastern curtains formed of rows of reeds with beads (here pearls) at the joints, the pearls being of course the drops of water.

He might not come more nigh nor turn away.
For chase or pastime all his force was o'er,
He bit upon his finger, wildered sore. [1]
Unwitting of that gaze the Jasmine-breast, [2]
For o'er her narcisse did her jacinth rest, [3]
When passed the musky cloud [4] from her sun-face,
That beauty looked and saw there full of grace
A Humá [5] set an eagle-wing upon, [6]
A Cypress become flagstaff for the sun. [7]
That Fount of radiance [8] for her shame and fright
Did tremble like the moon on water bright.
Nor other help could find that Moon most fair

[1] 'Biting upon the finger,' i. e. raising the finger to the lips, is a conventional expression with the Eastern writers to indicate that the person whom they describe as so doing is filled with bewilderment or admiration.

[2] 'Jasmine-breast' i. e. white sweet-scented breast, another term for a beauty.

[3] i. e. her hair had fallen over her eyes.

[4] The 'musky choud' is her dark sweet-scented hair.

[5] The Humá is the bird of paradise. In old times it was held to be of the happiest augury, any one whose head it overshadowed in its flight being certain of good fortune. It was said never to alight on the ground, and to live entirely on bones, hurting no living creature.

[6] i. e. Shírín saw the Prince auspicious as the Humá mounted on his steed fleet as an eagle.

[7] The 'cypress,' the stock image for a tall, slight, graceful figure, here stands for the figure of the Prince, while the 'sun' is his face. The imagery in this line is curious and unusual. The only similar instance that I can recall occurs in the Arabian Nights, where in the Twenty-second Night and again in the Conclusion we read: —

وَ شَمْسٍ فِي قَضِيبٍ فِي كَثِيبٍ * تَبَدَّت فِي قَمِيصٍ جُلَنَّارِ

which is thus rendered in Sir Richard Burton's translation: —

'A sun on wand in knoll of sand she showed
'Clad in her cramoisy-hued chemisette.'

On page 250 of the ninth volume the translator thus explains the first line: 'A sun (face) on wand (neck) in knoll of sand (hips) she showed.' But the 'flagstaff,' which replaces the 'wand' in the Turkish verse, stands for the 'cypress,' and so represents not the neck, but the figure, of the Prince.

[8] The 'Fount of radiance' is Shírín who is pictured as trembling in the pond, as the reflection of the beautiful moon trembles on rippling water.

Than round her she should cast her flowing hair.
She wrapped her in her loosened hair straightway,
She veiléd with the darksome night the day.[1]

From the Khusrev u Shírín: [51]

Khusrev-i Pervíz and Shírín visit the River Aras.

One day the Monarch fair and happy-starred,
To wit, Khusrev, the Heaven-resplendent lord,
Went forth the regions round about to sight,
And with him rode that Queen of beauties bright.
(Whoe'er hath by his side his lovesome Queen, —
In every spot hath he a winsome scene.)
They pass from stage to stage o'er hill and plain,
And joy in field and meadow free and fain.
They reach the stream that men call Aras, where
The soil is musky, balmy is the air.
They see a limpid river clear and pure,
Enow the sorrows of the heart to cure.
'Twas filled with lotus-blooms and lilies bright;
Its banks with meads and gardens fair were dight;
The narcisse cast upon the rose its eye;
And hand in hand the flowers in ranks stood by;
Its ruby lip the tulip offered prone,
The dew its pearly teeth had struck thereon.[2]
The royal pair were fain of this fair site,
And gave the word that there the tents be pight.
They reared the throne, and Pervíz sat thereon;
And all the gear of mirth[3] was ready soon;
And by his side the Venus-visaged fair, —
(The Sun and shining Moon thou'dst deemed them there.)
As unto happy fortune won had they,
They raised one throne in place of two that day.

[1] The 'night' is her hair; the 'day,' her face or her body.
The dew is conceived as amorously biting the lip of the tulip.
'The gear of mirth,' i. e. all things needful for a carouse, wine, musical instruments, etc.

And youths and houris stood on either hand,
As 'twere Rizwán in Paradisal land.
A-singing to his lute Bárbud sat there;
Nigísá, music-thrilled, made answer e'er.
For Shírín's lip that stream as Kevser shone,
As sugar-canes the reeds that grew thereon. [1]
The Queen's fair face, reflected there did seem
A ruby of Badakhshán [2] in the stream;
The while that ruby's taste it pictured still
Its mouth did water and with sugar fill; [3]
It swallows 'fore that julep-lip its spawl,
As thirsting hearts before the sea, withal. [4]
To voice such plight as this that held the King
Began the lutist this ghazel to sing: —

Ghazel.

For yonder coral-lip my soul 's athirst,
As parchéd frame for life to ensoul 's athirst.
My vitals, for this yearning, black are burnt,
Like scorchéd grass for rain that tholes athirst.
Have pity, life it yields, O Khizr of coolth;
Iskender for Life's Fountain's roll 's athirst.
Although the world with water sweet were filled,
Oh deem not slaked his drought whose soul 's athirst.

[1] i. e. the sweet presence of Shírín made all things sweet.

[2] Badakhshán in Central Asia was supposed to yield the finest rubies; hence 'Badakhshán rubies' became a stock phrase with the poets, something like our 'Orient pearls.'

[3] This is an example of the rhetorical figure Husn-i Taʿlíl or Ætiology (see p. 113). The stream is of course full of running water, but the poet conceives that this is its mouth watering at the thought of how sweet must be the taste (i. e. the kiss) of Shírín's lip.

[4] This couplet contains another example of the same figure.

From the Khusrev u Shírín. [52]

The Death of Ferhád.

That hag blear-eyed as vulture foul of show,
That hag ill-voiced as blackest corbie-crow,
When she received the word, set out forthright,
And gained Mount Bí-Sitún in doleful plight.
She came and sat her down hard by Ferhád,
And beat her breast a while and moaned full sad.
Then she, 'Unhappy one, for whom this toil?
'For whom dost night and day thus strain and moil?'
And he, 'My heart 's athirst her lip to drain,
And so I rive the rocks and hills atwain.
'Who brings from thorn the bloom, from rock the stream,
'Hath shown me mid this Mount His Beauty's beam.' [1]
Then she of bitter deed full deeply sighed: —
'Ah! Ferhád doth not know Shírín hath died!
'Alas! where is that sweetest Cypress now!
'Before the blast of Death laid stark and low!
'Ah! where that winsome one, that gracious fere!
'What villainy hath wrought the tyrant Sphere! [2]
'They 've laved her frame with many a bitter tear,
'They 've plied the ambergris and the ʿabír; [3]
'They 've laid that radious Pearl within the clay;
''Tis souls, not robes, they 've rent: ah, wel-a-way!'
She ceased, and sighed and dreary moan did make;
Her tongue showered venom even as a snake.
How comes it, when this evil thing she sware,
She fell not, burnt to ashes then and there?
How when that mole, those dusky locks she named,
She was not stricken dumb, black-visaged, shamed?
When into Ferhád's ears those words had sunk,
Thou'dst deemed he had of mortal poison drunk.

[1] Made manifest through Shírín who had visited him there.

[2] See p. 44, n. 3.

[3] ʿAbír is an unguent made of various perfumes. After a corpse is washed and shrouded, perfumes are burned beside it and sprinkled over it.

Away he dashed, as one whose bonds are broke,
And hurled him headlong from the topmost rock.
Adown the mount like a great rock he went,
A-wailing for his bitter drearíment.
He struck the ground and cried, 'Where? Shírín! Where?'
And yielded up his soul in anguish there.
His bird was weary of this narrow nest, [1]
And fled in highest Heaven's fields to rest.
He learned the body is the spirit's veil;
The veil is rent, and cast aside the bale.

[1] His 'bird' is his soul; the 'nest,' the body, or perhaps, the world.

CHAPTER VII.

The Hurufis.

Nesímí. Refí'í.

Somewhere about the year 785 (1383), when the Ottoman throne was occupied by Sultan Murád I and when Ahmedí was writing his Iskender-Náme, there arose a new Prophet in the Eastern lands. This was Fazl-ulláh the son of Abu-Muhammed of Tebríz, surnamed el-Hurúfí or 'the Literalist.' Almost all we know concerning the life of this teacher is contained in the following brief passage from the Arab historian Ibn-Hajar whose work we have already referred to when speaking of Cadi Burhán-ud-Dín.[1] 'Fazl-ulláh,' says this biographer, 'was one of the ascetics among the innovators. He was of the heretics, and finally he originated the sect which is known as the Hurúfís (i. e. Literalists); and he gave out that the letters were metamorphoses of men, together with many other groundless fictions. And he called the Emír Timur the Lame to his heresy. And he (Timur) sought to slay him (Fazl-ulláh). And this came to the knowledge of his (Timur's) son — for he (Fazl-ulláh) had taken refuge with him (Timur's son) — and so he (Timur's son) smote off his (Fazl-ulláh's) head with his own hand. And this came to the knowledge of Timur, whereupon he demanded his head

[1] See p. 205.

and his body, and he burned them both in this year, to wit, the year 804 (1401-2).'

Our knowledge regarding the doctrines taught by Fazl-ulláh is not very much greater than our information as to his life; for although several manuscripts of his own and his disciples' works have been for long preserved in some of the great public libraries of Europe, these works remained quite unnoticed till the year 1898, when Mr. E. G. Browne published an article on the Hurúfí Sect in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.[1] Fazl-ulláh himself was, so far as is known, the author of three works, namely, the Jávidán-Náme[2] or 'Eternal-Book,' the Mahabbet-Náme or 'Book of Love,' and a poem called ʿArsh-Náme or 'The Book of the Throne.'[3] The most important known Hurúfí work — other than those due to Fazl-ulláh — is the Istiwá-Náme or 'Book of the Ascent,' which was composed subsequent to 828 (1424-5) by Emír Ghiyás-ud-Dín Muhammed.[4] All these

[1] To this article, which, apart from one or two Turkish poems, forms the only source of information concerning the Hurúfí doctrines accessible to me, I am indebted for most of what is said in the present chapter regarding the tenets of the sect.

[2] As Mr. Browne points out in an interesting account of this work in his Catalogue of the Persian MSS. belonging to the University of Cambridge, its correct title is Jávidán(-Náme)-i Kebír or 'The Great Eternal (Book);' but the Turkish Hurúfí poets always refer to it simply as the Jávidán-Náme.

[3] The title ʿArsh-Náme or 'Book of the Throne' has reference to the last word of the Koranic text ثُمَّ ٱسْتَوَىٰ عَلَى ٱلْعَرْشِ Thumme 'stewa ʿale-'l-ʿarsh, 'Then He (God) ascended upon the Throne,' a text which is constantly quoted or alluded to by the Hurúfís with whom the 'Throne' represents Man. It was, according to Kátib Chelebi, on account of this book that Fazl-ulláh was put to death by 'the Sword of the Law.' It is not quite certain whether there is a copy of the ʿArsh-Náme in Europe; Mr. Browne found a poem in the metre in which the ʿArsh-Náme is known to be written, bound up with a copy of the Istiwá-Náme in a MS. belonging to the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. He conceives this may be Fazl-ulláh's poem; but is not yet fully satisfied as to the identity.

[4] This book has been described by Mr. Browne in his article in the J. R. A. S.

books are in the Persian language, and all, except the ʿArsh-Náme, are in prose. They are, however, very hard to understand, as they are full of contractions and enigmatic symbols, the precise meaning of which it is not always possible to determine, which indeed were made use of in order to conceal the conceptions they indicate from the eyes of the heretic-hunting orthodox. The task of discovering what were the special features of Fazl-ulláh's teaching is rendered yet more difficult by the fact that the Hurúfí books, like most of their class, are utterly unsystematic in their arrangement. Mr. Browne has, however, been able to extricate from this seemingly hopeless tangle the following four points which appear to be the most prominent of the peculiar doctrines of the Hurúfí sect: — [1]

1. There exists a hidden science, to acquire which is at once the supreme duty and the supreme happiness of man, indicating and explaining the meaning and significance of all things in Heaven above and in earth beneath, and the mystical correspondences which unite them.

2. This hidden science is contained in the Koran; but the key which unlocks it was in the hands of Fazl-ulláh, and, after him, passed to his Successor. By them it was disclosed to the believers.

3. Man, created in the Image of God, 'in the Best of Forms,' [2] is the Microcosm, the Book of God, the Throne on which God ascended when He had finished the creation of all inferior and subordinate creatures, [3] an Object of

The title is taken from the second word in the Koranic text quoted in the preceding note. For the usual acceptation of the term ʿArsh, see p. 35.

[1] These are transferred (slightly condensed) from Mr. Browne's article.

[2] This expression is Koranic: in ch. xcv, v. 4, we read: 'We have indeed created man in the best of forms.'

[3] Referring to the Koranic text quoted in n. 3, on the preceding page.

Worship to the Angels, save Iblís (Satan) who waxed proud and refused. [1]

4. While there is a deep meaning of infinite significance both in the Koran and in the religious observances (prayer, fasting, pilgrimage, etc.) which it ordains, the merely literal meaning of the former and the merely formal fulfilment of the latter are entirely devoid of importance.

Among the most striking of the peculiarities special to Hurúfí writings are the fanciful analogies referred to as 'mystical correspondences' in the first of the foregoing articles of belief. Perhaps the most favourite of these is the parallel set up between Man 'the Book of God' and the Koran, which is also the Book of God. This is worked out in detail; thus the Head or Face of Man corresponds to the Fátiha or Opening Chapter of the Koran; and as the latter comprises Seven Signs or Verses, [2] so in the Face of Man are there Seven Signs or Lines, namely, the hair, two eyebrows, and four rows of eyelashes, — which Seven Signs or Lines he brings with him when he issues from the womb of Eve, who is therefore styled the 'Mother of the Book,' [3] a title which she shares along with the Fátiha and with the Face of Man as corresponding to the Fátiha.

It is, however, to the mystic significations which he attributed to the letters of the alphabet and to combinations of

[1] This refers to the Koranic story mentioned in n. 5, p. 119.

[2] Whence the Fátiha is sometimes called Seb^{c}-ul-Mesání or 'The Seven of the Repetition.' This term, which is frequently used by Hurúfí writers, is borrowed from the Koran itself, where in ch. xv, v. 87, we read 'And we have already brought thee the Seven of the Repetition,' — the reference being to the Fátiha.

[3] Of this term, Umm-ul-Kitáb, which also is Koranic, occurring in iii, 5, and elsewhere, various interpretations are given; some say it refers to the Fátiha (this is the usual opinion); some, to the fundamental parts of the Koran; others, to the Preserved Tablet on which is inscribed the original of the Koran (see p. 35); and so on.

these that Fazl-ulláh owes his distinctive title of Hurúfí, that is, 'He of the Letters,' 'the Literalist,' a title which was straightway adopted by or given to the sect he founded. As an example of the fantastic way in which the letters were dealt with, Mr. Browne cites the treatment of the first verse of the much-suffering Fátiha. The 18 letters contained in this verse are taken to represent the 18,000 worlds, of which, according to an ancient Eastern tradition already mentioned, the universe consists. [1] Now the Sum of the Universe, as we have seen before, [2] is sometimes expressed by 'God *plus* What is beside God.' If we take away the 4 letters which in Arabic form Alláh or 'God' from 18, we have 14, which number therefore represents the 'What is beside God,' i. e. the phenomenal or material universe, all contingent existence. This same number 14, to which the Hurúfís seem to have attached great importance, they get at in another way. The Arabic alphabet which, according to them, represents the Sum of the Universe, i. e. 'God *plus* What is beside God,' consists of 28 letters; if we deduct what they call the 'fourteen letters of God,' [3] we have again 14 letters left to represent the 'What is beside.' Scarcely less importance was attached to the number 32, which represents the 28 letters of the Arabic alphabet *plus* the 4 letters added thereto by the Persians.

Mr. Browne, in the interesting and valuable paper of which I have made so free a use, gives many more particulars concerning this strange and little-known sect in which he

[1] See p. 54.

[2] See p. 181, n. 1.

[3] Perhaps, the 14 letters contained in the formula اَللّٰهُ لَا اِلٰـهَ اِلَّا هُوَ 'God, there is no god but He;' or perhaps, the 'Fourteen Letters of the Koran,' i. e. the 14 different detached letters which stand at the beginning of certain chapters of the Koran.

traces a resemblance to the old Isma'ílís on the one hand and to the modern Bábís on the other. Enough, however, has been said for our purpose here. We need only add that Hurúfíism was in no sense a new religion, it was merely a Muhammedan, or more strictly, a Súfí sect; the Jávidán-Náme and other books of Fazl-ulláh make no pretension to abrogate or even to supersede the Koran, they simply expound it in a peculiar fashion of their own. Again the cabalistic science known as 'Ilm-i Hurúf or the 'Science of the Letters' (i. e. Onomancy), whence the sect gets its name, is among the oldest branches of occult lore, while we have come across more than one reference to the virtues of the Letters conceived as elements of Words, themselves the expression of Thought. Here Fazl-ulláh did but work up afresh ancient materials which he found ready to his hand, and adapt them to the requirements of his special theories. Thus again is exemplified what we learned in the First Chapter to look upon as one of the most striking characteristics of Eastern thought, namely, the persistence of ideas once accepted, and the recurrent appearance of these, more or less modified or disguised to meet the exigencies of altered conditions.

The distinctive feature of Hurúfíism as presented by the Turkish poets is, however, neither the cabalistic notion of an occult virtue attaching to the letters, nor the fantastic analogies imagined between sacred texts and members of the human frame; it is the deification of man conceived as the Divine theophany. The roots of this conception, which underlies all the writings of Nesímí and Refí'í, may be discovered in the mystic's watch-word, 'Whoso knoweth himself knoweth his Lord,' in the philosopher's presentment of man as the microcosm containing in miniature within himself all that exists in the great cosmos without, and in that ideal, common to thinkers of both schools, of the

Perfect Man. But the Hurúfís pushed these ideas farther and in a direction other than originally intended, for they extended to the body what was meant to apply only to the Soul. The apotheosis of the merely material part of man was perhaps a not unnatural outcome of the pantheism which had prevailed for ages upon every hand; and it may be that a consciousness on the part of the ʿulemá of the imminence of such danger contributed in some measure to the ruthlessness wherewith the sect was hunted down. In any case, it is this presentation of humanity, or at least of the beautiful members of humanity, as the proper objects of worship and adoration, that distinguishes the Hurúfí poets from all other Turkish writers, and that caused the adherents of this sect to be regarded by the orthodox as the most impious of blasphemers.

The best-known of the Turkish Hurúfí poets is the gifted and devoted Seyyid ʿImád-ud-Dín, famous in the national literature under his makhlas of Nesímí. With the exception of ʿÁshiq, who connects him with Ámed or Diyár-bekr, the biographers are agreed that he was a native of a place called Nesím in the district of Baghdad, whence, they say, his pen-name of Nesímí. ʿÁshiq and ʿÁlí are probably correct in making him of Turkman extraction, as the regions of ʿIráq are largely peopled by clans and families of that race. That there was an Arab somewhere, however, in his genealogical tree is indicated by his title of Seyyid, a title given to those alone who can trace descent from the Prophet.

Latífí, the biographer who is responsible for the statement that Nesímí and Sheykhí met one another at Brusa, says that the former poet came to Rúm in the time of Murád Khan Ghází. The Sultan here meant must be Murád I who reigned from 761 (1359) to 792 (1390), and not Murád II, as ʿÁlí imagines, seeing that the latter monarch did not succeed till 824 (1421), four years after the execution of the poet.

The details of Nesímí's life are unrecorded; but it is clear, alike from his own poems and from the meagre scraps of information to be gleaned from biographers and historians, that his was one of those eager, subtle, enthusiastic natures that have at no time been uncommon among Eastern peoples, natures to which the quest of Truth is the one thing needful, which pursue the same with intensest fervour and most single-minded devotion, and which, when they have

found what they believe to be the sought-for Light, welcome it with a passionate love which in the delirium of its exaltation sets them beside themselves, frenzied, and reckless of all else in existence.

Before he fell in with Fazl-ulláh the Hurúfí, Nesímí had, in pursuit of this need of his soul, frequented other mystic teachers of the day, and, if we may believe Latífí, had formed some connection with the sect or school founded by Sheykh Shiblí, a famous Súfí saint of early times.[1] It was in all probability from Fazl-ulláh's own lips that Nesímí learned the Hurúfí doctrines. That the two men were personally acquainted seems almost certain; the language of the Ottoman biographers points to this, as also do the allusions and anecdotes in the Hurúfí books. There can at any rate be no doubt that the Turkish poet had accepted the doctrines of the Persian teacher some time before the latter perished at the hands of Timur's son. This is shown by an anecdote in the Istiwá-Náme, in which the author Ghiyás-ud-Dín tells of a discussion between himself and Fazl-ulláh on certain technical points in Nesímí's poems which took place at a conference where these poems were being read. The poet must therefore have embraced the Hurúfí doctrines some time before the year 804 (1401-2).

Not content with being a disciple, Nesímí became a missionary, and made at least one convert whose name is remembered to the present day. This is the poet Refí'í, a manuscript of whose Besháret-Náme or 'Book of Glad Tidings' is preserved in the British Museum.[2] In this book, which was written in 811 (1409), the author speaks of Nesímí, his

[1] Sheykh Shiblí was born at Sámará in 'Iráq in 247 (861-2), and died in Baghdad in 334 (945-6).

Latífí's statement derives some colour from the fact that Nesímí mentions Shiblí from time to time in his Díwán.

[2] Add. 5,986.

spiritual guide, with the greatest reverence and affection; and as he alludes to the bonds and imprisonments uncomplainingly endured by his dear master, it is probable that even by this time the indiscreet zeal of Nesímí had aroused the hostility of the ʿulemá.

Towards the end of his career Nesímí seems to have cast aside every shred of self-control. His Hurúfíism would appear to have fallen into the background, and Mansúr-i Halláj,[1] the martyr-ecstatic, to have become his paragon. It was not enough for him to extol this beloved exemplar, to flout and revile his blinded executioners, and to declare that a death such as his was the highest bliss the Lover could attain. Such conduct, though naturally reprehensible in the eyes of the orthodox, might have been overlooked; but Nesímí, possessed by a conviction that the Day of Grace was come, and that they to whom God had revealed the truth must no more keep silence, roamed the country crying aloud the very words for uttering which Mansúr had perished, — those mysterious and awful words, I am The Truth! I am God! which, whatever their import on the lips of the mystic devotee, are rank blasphemy in the eye of the Canon Law of Islam.

In vain did Sháh Khandán, Nesímí's own brother and, like himself, a dervish mystic, seek to restrain this all too fervid ardour; in vain did he appeal to the poet to respect the sacred mysteries of their faith and cease proclaiming them in the face of the unworthy multitude.

> 'Look ye, unto none disclose that Secret Word;
> 'Feed not from the Chosen's board the common herd,'[2]

he wrote; but Nesímí vouchsafed no reply save these verses from one of his poems: —

[1] See p. 21, n. 2.

[2] کل بو سرّی کمسیه فاش ایلمه * خوان خاصی عامیه آش ایلمه

'Stirred to its depths is the Circling Ocean,[1]
'Being and Space are in wild commotion!
''Tis the Secret Eternal's revelation;
'Shall the Lover practise dissimulation!'[2]

Nesímí courted his doom. Never was saint or confessor of the early Church more eager to win the martyr's crown than this dervish poet. It was in the city of Aleppo that his heart's desire came to him. There, by the Arab ʿulemá — the city was then in the hands of the Egyptian Memlúks — was Nesímí found guilty of blasphemy on the evidence of his own poems, and condemned to be flayed alive.

Concerning his death ʿAlí tells the following story. Among those present to witness the execution was the Muftí of Aleppo by whose fetwa the poet was condemned. This legist waxed vehement in denunciation of his victim, and pointing towards him, cried, 'Unclean is he! unclean is his death! did but one drop of his blood touch any limb, that limb must needs be cut off!' Just then a drop of Nesímí's blood, spirting forward, fell upon the Muftí's finger and stained it red. An ancient Súfí, who was standing near, observed this and said, 'In accordance with your own fetwa, Muftí, it is now become needful that your finger be cut off.' 'Ah,' replied the legist, 'it fell on me while I was exemplifying; so legally naught is needful.'[3] Nesímí saw what had passed,

[1] The great ocean which according to the ancient tradition surrounds the earth. See p. 38.

[2] دریای محیط جوشه کلدی * کونیله مکان خروشه کلدی
سرّ ازل اولدی آشکارا * عاشق نیاجه ایلسون مدارا

[3] This refers to a well-known phrase تمثیلده خطا یوق 'in exemplifying is no evil,' which is used by teaching members of the ʿulemá when they show or explain to their pupils how canonically to perform certain actions. The Muftí here of course perverts the meaning of the phrase to make it suit his own purpose.

and from the hands of the tormentors rebuked the cowardly evasion by this extemporized couplet: —

'So thou'd cut the zealot's finger, from the truth he turns and flees!
'Lo, this hapless Lover weeps not though they flay him head to foot!' [1]

According to Kátib Chelebi this tragedy took place in the year 820 (1417-8).

So perished he whom the Hurúfí books entitle the Beatified Martyr; but it is very doubtful whether it really was for Hurúfíism that Nesímí laid down his life. Latífí distinctly says that what led to his condemnation was the following verse: —

Mansúr declared 'I am The Truth!' His words were truth, 'twas truth he spake;
Nor aught of dole was in his doom, by aliens on the gibbet hanged. [2]

If this is so, it is clear that at any rate the avowed reason of the poet's execution was not his connection with the Hurúfí heretics, but his unlawful proclamation of a well-known and widely spread Súfí tenet.

It is evident from the sympathetic tone which they adopt towards Nesímí that this was the opinion of the old biographers. Those writers were all professedly orthodox Muslims and would not have dared — even had they so desired — to express their admiration of the obstinate adherent of a notorious heresiarch; but on the other hand they, or at least most of them, and of their readers also, were more or less imbued with Súfíistic ideas, and in their hearts felt and believed far more truly after the fashion of Nesímí the Mansúrian than after that of his orthodox executioners. The only

1 زاهدك يك پرمغين كسسك دونر حقدن كچر
كور بو مسكين عاشقى سريا صويرلر اغلمز

2 منصور انا الحق سويلدى حق در سوزى حق سويلدى
آنوك جزاسى غم دكل بيكانه‌دن بردار ايمش

notable exception is ʿAshiq Chelebi who dismisses Nesímí in a few somewhat contemptuous lines which show sufficiently that his sympathies were with the ʿulemá. But this writer appears to have had an unusual aversion to mystics of every class, an aversion which he is at little pains to conceal, and for which he is repeatedly and severely castigated by Esrár Dede the special biographer of the Mevlevî poets.

As they give some idea of how far men ostensibly orthodox could forget their orthodoxy in the presence of Súfí enthusiasm, it will be interesting and instructive to reproduce the remarks made by those biographers who are apologists for Nesímí when dealing with the crucial subjects of his alleged crime and his execution.

Latífí,[1] who describes Nesímí as 'the Dauntless Champion of the Field of Love, the Glorious Sacrifice of the Kaʿba of Affection,' says, 'Whoso knoweth not from what Station he (Nesímí) uttered that Word (I am The Truth!) and hath not found annihilation in the Essential Unity, can have no understanding of his case. Towards the close of his life, attraction from the World Unseen laid hold on him, and many a time was he beside himself, when, powerless of self-restraint and self-control, he would publish and proclaim Mysteries which it is needful to conceal.' 'In the terminology of the Sheykhs (i. e. Mystics) they call this Station Qurb-i Feráʾiz.[2] It is the Station wherein the Lover passeth from

[1] I translate from a MS. of Latífí's Tezkire in my collection, which is here and in many other places fuller than the printed edition.

[2] The term Qurb-i Feráʾiz which means 'The Proximity (to God) resulting from (the Observance of) the Things Commanded,' is thus explained in the 'Dictionary of the Technical Terms used in the Sciences of the Musulmans, edited by Sprenger and Lees, 1862: 'This is the entire annihilation of the worshipper from consciousness of all created existences, including even his own, in such a way that naught remaineth in his view save the existence of The Truth. And this is the meaning of 'the annihilation of the worshipper in God.' And it is the fruit of the (observance of the) things commanded.'

himself and becometh one with the Beloved. Its similitude in external things is the annihilation of individuality in the rain-drop that falleth into the sea. Whoso looketh merely at the outside thereof seeth blasphemy; but in the eyes of the initiate it is the Perfect Faith. And it is blasphemy in the eyes of them who see but the outside, for this that it is a strange whirlpool hard by the stead of blasphemy. And should anyone (which God forbid), ere he hath reached that Station and become united with The Truth, speak such words through blind imitation, that indeed were blasphemy.' 'At length the Arab Imáms in the city of Aleppo, saying, "Outwardly this word is contrary to the Sacred Law," gave judgment that he be put to death; and hearkening not, neither listening to the interpretation of his saying, did they flay him. They looked but to the outside of the word, and went the way of the Law; for the point at which look the executors of the Law is the outside, and not what is hidden and what is meant.'

Hasan Chelebi writes, in the grandiloquent and ultra-Persian style that he affects: 'The reins of self-restraint and free-will passed from the hand of his control, and as the delirium of Love overmastered the Sultan Reason, involuntarily was he instant in the divulgement of the Mysteries and in the discovery of the Secrets; and he proclaimed in every market-place things which alike by reason and by the Law it is needful to conceal. Therefore in the city of Aleppo, by judgment of the Imáms of the Law, was he slain on the field of Love and Passion, and laved in the cleansing water of Martyrdom. In very truth, when the Sultan of the throne of Love and Ardour, upraising the ensigns of victory and mastery complete, would hurl the vanquished of the field of amaze into the abyss of disaster and calamity, and would part the bewildered reelers in the waste of terror and amaze from

the companion Reason and the guide Understanding, their feeble hearts (which are the treasuries of the mysteries of truth) become powerless to conceal the secrets of the Godhead, and their frail bodies (which are the bearers of the burden of the Trust [1]) chafe against carrying the load of the Law; so perforce do sighs and groans issue from their woeful souls, and that veiled converse is made public as the day, and the hidden secret becometh manifest to the world. It is even as saith that Pilgrim of the Typal and the Real, that Leader of the Field of Love, that Knower of the Secret, Khoja Háfiz of Shíráz: —

'My heart from hand escapeth! O men of heart! By Heaven!
'Woe 's me! My Secret Hidden will now to all be given!" [2]

Those extracts throw a flood of light on the real attitude towards religious subjects of the vast majority of cultured Turks before the days of the Western learning.

Latífí, perhaps anxious to screen the 'Dauntless Champion of the Field of Love' from the opprobrium of connection with an heretical sect of ill repute, mentions a report that Nesímí was not actually a Hurúfí of the sect of Fazl-ulláh, but was merely a proficient in the cabalistic science dealing

[1] 'The Trust,' this is a reference to the Koranic text, xxxiii, 72: 'Verily, We offered the trust to the heavens and the earth and the mountains, but they refused to bear it, and shrank from it; but man bore it.' The orthodox commentators generally explain this 'trust' from which the mightiest objects in nature shrank, but which man accepted, to be the Faith with the tremendous responsibilities this involves. The mystics however interpret it to be the esoteric doctrine, and say that in the 'man' who bears it we are to see the Lover, he who alone is 'Man' in the highest sense.

So in this passage Hasan means that they who bear this tremendous burden of awful knowledge, from which the very heavens and earth recoiled, have no strength left to patiently support the yet further load of the external and ceremonial Law.

[2] دل میرود زدستم صاحب دلان خدارا
دردا که راز پنهان خواهد شد آشکارا

with the virtues and properties of the letters of the alphabet; and he adds that it is so written in the book called Menáqib-ul-Wásilín or 'The Acts of the Attainers.' [1] There can, however, be no manner of doubt that Nesímí was really a Hurúfí and a disciple of Fazl-ulláh. Even if his own poems, which abound in Hurúfí catch-words, were insufficient evidence, we have the statement of his pupil Refí'í who tells us that it was by Nesímí that he was initiated into the doctrines of Fazl-ulláh. The Hurúfí books again frequently mention him either as Nesímí or as Seyyid 'Imád, and speak of him as being one of the most brilliant lights of their school; Ghiyás-ud-Dín indeed in the Istiwá-Náme places him among the seven 'most learned, most perfect, most excellent, most eminent dervishes of the age.' The utmost that can be allowed is that Nesímí's enthusiasm for Hurúfíism may possibly have somewhat waned towards the close of his life under the stress of his fervour for the ways of Mansúr.

Nesímí's literary work consists of two Díwáns, one Turkish, the other Persian, besides a number of poems in Arabic. The Turkish Díwán, with which alone we are concerned, is much the larger and more important. It contains one piece of about fifty lines in mesneví form, the same from which the author sent a verse or two in answer to his brother's appeal, somewhere between 250 and 300 ghazels — several of which are of inordinate length, — and over 150 rubá'ís or quatrains.

Two elements, the Súfí and the Hurúfí, meet and blend in Nesímí's poetry, with the result that his Díwán stands by itself in Turkish literature. The Súfí element he shares in common with hundreds of his fellow-poets; all that differentiates him here is the quite unusual frequency of his references to Mansúr, and the persistence with which he

[1] I have been unable to find any trace of a book so named. The 'Attainers' of the title are doubtless the saints who have attained to mystic union with God.

asserts his own pretension to the Divine Ipseity. This last point no doubt underlies almost all Súfí poetry, but it is rarely proclaimed so audaciously and undisguisedly.

It is therefore the Hurúfí element in his work that really gives Nesímí his unique position. Being a true poet, he selected and presents almost exclusively that aspect of Hurúfíism which alone is capable of poetic treatment. Except for a stray line or two, chiefly in the quatrains, where the mystic import of the numbers 28 and 32 is suggested, the cabalistic side of the doctrine is completely ignored. What took captive Nesímí's imagination, and what he lovingly dwells on in every poem in his book, is the conception embodied in the third of the four articles of Hurúfí faith mentioned a little while ago. The root of this conception, the self-revelation of God in humanity, is a perfectly familiar Súfíistic idea; but to the Súfí the fair human form is only a mirror in which is reflected the Divine Beauty, and so the love which such mirror inspires is merely the 'Typal Love' which is but the 'Bridge' to the 'Real Love,' that is, to the love of the Reality shadowed therein.[1] To the Hurúfí, on the other hand, the fair human form is not simply a reflection, it is an incarnation of the Deity; and the love which it inspires is not a mere 'Bridge' to something else, but is itself the goal.

Here we have the key-note of Nesímí's poetry. He sees the Revealer present indwelling in the Revelation; and so in his eyes the fair object of his love is not merely the mirror of God, but is God.

'Who saith then unto thee, "Nay, thou art not God,"?
'Who knows thee not for God, from God is sundered!'[2]

[1] See pp. 20-1.

[2] سکا کیمدر دین کیم حق دکلسن
سنی حق بیلمین حقدن جدا در

he cries; and the cry rings from end to end through his Díwán.

It follows that the love inspired by the beloved thus conceived must be itself the end and goal, as there is nothing higher to which it can lead. Moreover, the Beloved, being God, is properly the object not only of the poet's love, but of his adoration. And not of his adoration alone, but of that of all men; and he who refuses to bow down and worship the Beloved is a devil; for was it not the Devil, and the Devil only, who refused to obey the command of God and fall down in adoration before the man Adam?

This brings us to another peculiarity of Nesímí's poetry; that is the extreme frequency with which he quotes passages, sometimes mere expressions, from the Koran and Traditions, and the ingenious subtlety with which he contrives to make these appear to confirm and bear out his own conclusions. Thus the incident just referred to, the refusal of Iblís to worship Adam at God's bidding, which occurs in the Koranic story of the creation, [1] is continually presented as a Divine confirmation of the Hurúfí doctrine that the human form is a fitting object of adoration and that whoso refuses to acknowledge this is a rebel even as Satan himself. Again, there is a Koranic text which runs, 'Everything doth perish except His face,' [2] referring of course to the face of God; this Nesímí and the other Hurúfís represent as referring to the human face (to which, as we have seen, they attribute extraordinary significance) and then deduce therefrom the eternity, and consequently, the divinity of humanity.

That arguments such as these, which to us seem so puerile and so little convincing, should have been seriously set forth

[1] See p. 119, n. 5.
[2] Koran, xxviii, 88.

and fervently believed by men of more than average intelligence may appear scarcely credible. But the East is not as the West; and, as the scholar whom I have so often quoted in this chapter [1] most truly says, while for the Western the essentials of religion are Faith and Righteousness, for the Eastern they are Knowledge and Mystery. The more subtle therefore and intricate a religious system is, and the more it professes to explain, the stronger is its appeal to the more highly strung type of Eastern mind. Of the sincerity of Nesímí's belief in the ideas he took up there can be no question. The story of his life and death is warrant enough for that. But even if we knew nothing of this story, and had only his Díwán in our hands, we could no more doubt the absolute sincerity than we could the passionate ardour of the man who wrote those pages.

It is this utter single-mindedness combined with this white-heat of passion that has made Nesímí the first true poet of the Western Turks, the only true poet of this far-off Period. They are no vain words in which ʿAlí says that it is Nesímí who first gave lustre to Turkish poetry. In his verse, more than in that of any of the poets we have yet considered, we can hear the note of inspiration. Those have striven with varying success to reproduce in their own language something they have studied in another; Nesímí sings because he must, because he himself has a message that demands deliverance. And Love lends eloquence to his tongue; his expression is more graceful, his language more perfect, than that of any predecessor or contemporary. And so when we read his impassioned lyrics, a-thrill with ecstasy and rapture and clothed in gracious melody, we almost forget the fantastic features of Hurúfí doctrine, and feel that

[1] Mr. Browne.

this old poet too has indeed, after his own fashion, looked upon the Face of God.

In Nesímí's poems there is of course no formal exposition of any Hurúfí doctrine; these are taken as established, and a knowledge of them on the part of the reader is presupposed. Without such knowledge the poems are in great part unintelligible, and this is my excuse for having dwelt upon these doctrines at so much greater length than their importance may appear to warrant. Nesímí nowhere applies the term Hurúfí either to himself or to his fellow-sectaries; they are simply Lovers, like any other mystics. He frequently refers, however, to the founder of his sect; but he generally translates the name Fazl-ulláh, which in Arabic means 'Grace of God,' into some such Persian equivalent as Fazl-i Yezdán or Fazl-i Khudá. His object in doing so was probably twofold; in the first place, as these Persian terms are less proper names than phrases signifying 'the grace of God,' the poet, by using them in lieu of his teacher's name, is able to produce a series of equivoques such as the Eastern loves; and in the second place, they would provide him with a ready retort should any orthodox critic object to the laudation of Fazl-ulláh the teacher, by enabling him to ask whether the objector disapproved of the celebration of the grace of God. If this last proceeding should appear to the reader to partake of the nature of an evasion, it must be borne in mind that to the mediæval Oriental, and above all to the Hurúfí, there was in words a vast deal more than the mere superficial signification; and so it might quite honestly be averred that when speaking of the grace of God, the conception of the individual so named and through whom this was revealed, was swallowed up and lost sight of in the far greater conception of the revelation itself.

In point of literary execution Nesímí's lyrics are ahead of all other poems of the same class that have hitherto been produced. His prosody is Persian throughout; and if at times he departs from the Persian usage, he is at least consistent in his departures. Some of his work must have been written prior to the Tartar invasion, as we have seen that Fazl-ulláh, who was one of Timur's innumerable victims, discussed verses by him with Ghiyás-ud-Dín; but no doubt much also was composed during the score or so of years that elapsed between his master's execution and his own. There is, however, no visible inequality in the workmanship of his ghazels; and it would be quite impossible to throw these into any kind of chronological order. The equal excellence of his earlier with his later work may perhaps be due to the circumstance that Nesímí was a great traveller and frequented the society of the saintly, who in those days were also the learned. In this way he would acquire, it may be almost unconsciously, a knowledge of form in poetry before such became general among the Turkish peoples.

The fame of Nesímí has long outlived that of the sect whose brightest ornament he was. For many a year, even to the present day, the poet has been looked upon as a saint and a martyr by thousands of his countrymen who have never so much as heard the name Hurúfí. Testimony to his reputation during the intervening centuries comes from an unexpected quarter. The old European travellers, Nicholay and Rycaut, in the curious and interesting, though naturally confused and inaccurate, accounts which they give of the religious sects in Turkey, both speak of the esteem in which the dervishes of their time held Nesímí. Nicholay, who visited Constantinople in 1551 in the suite of the French ambassador, tells us that there are among the Turks four religious sects. It is with the second of these, which he calls

the Qalenders,[1] and the members of which he describes as glorying in chastity and abstinence and as living in little 'churches' called Tekyes, that he associates Nesímí. Of those sectaries he says, speaking through his contemporary English translator:[2] 'These also goe reading of certain songs and common rymes compounded by one of their order called Nerzimi (Nesímí), whom they repute and take amongst them to have bin the first saint of their Religion, who for having spoken certaine words against the law of Mahomet, was in Azamia, which is Assyria,[3] flaide quicke, and by these means the first martyr of their Religion.'

In the entertaining volume entitled 'The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire,' which was written by Sir Paul Rycaut on his return to England after a five years' residence in Turkey, whither he had accompanied the mission sent by Charles II to Mehemmed IV in 1661, we get a long description of 'the Sects and Heresies in the Turkish Religion.' In the course of this the author speaks about the Bektashí dervish-order, of which he gives a very

[1] The order of the Qalenderís was founded by Qalender Yúsuf-i Endelusí, a Spanish Muslim who was contemporary with Hajji Bektash. In addition to purity of heart, spirituality of soul and exemption from all worldly defilement, he required of his proselytes that they should perpetually travel through the Muslim world and live wholly upon alms. They were further required to practise the severest acts of austerity in order to attain to the Heavenly favour, more especially the state of ecstasy and illumination. Hence the name Qalender came later to be applied to any dervish of any order who was distinguished above his fellows for works of supererogation, for Divine revelations, or for any special favour of Heaven. Later still the name fell into ill repute, and the Qalender was regarded as a dissolute antinomian who roamed the world doing whatsoever seemed good to him under the mask of a superior sanctity.

[2] 'The Navigations, Peregrinations and Voyages, made into Turkie,' by Nicholas Nicholay, Translated out of the French by T. Washington the Younger. London, 1585.

[3] In the Italian version of Nicholay's Travels, Azamia becomes Amazia (for Amasiya?), and the words 'which is Assyria' are omitted.

unfavourable account.[1] According to his information, this order was instituted in the time of 'Soleyman the Magnificent' (Suleymán I);[2] and he informs us that its members, besides being the most strict and superstitious of Muhammedans, 'hold it unlawful to adjoyn any Attributes to God, by saying that God is great, or God is merciful, by reason that the nature of God being infinite and incomprehensible, cannot fall under the weak and imperfect conceptions of mans understanding, which can imagine nothing applicable to his nature.' 'Of this sect was a famous Poet amongst the Turks called Nemisi (Nesímí), that was flead alive, for saying, when the Emaum (Imám) called the people to Prayers at the ordinary hours from the Steeple with the usual word Allah Ekber (Alláhu Ekber), God is one (really, 'God is Most Great'), that he lied, upon the supposition that no Epithete can be predicated of the Divine Essence.'

These statements are of course incorrect in detail, the old traveller was doubtless misinformed by the 'Polonian' convert

[1] Rycaut says the Bektashís were reputed to practise incest, whence they were called by some 'zerati' (perhaps for zirá'atí 'husbandman' in allusion to the metaphor wherewith, according to the information of the English writer, they were wont to defend their use), and by the vulgar 'mumsconduren' (for mum sugundiren, 'putters out of the candle'). The reason of this last by-name may be understood from the proverb مومِ سوبنديجك قيز ايله عورت سچلمز 'when the candle goes out { girl / daughter } cannot be distinguished from { woman,' / wife,' } a saying which, in its ordinary application, is equivalent to our proverb 'all cats are grey in the dark.'

[2] Suleymán I reigned from 926 (1520) to 974 (1566). Hajji Bektash, the patron of the Bektashí order, died not later than 792 (1390); see p. 179, n. 1. It is true, however, that during the reign of Suleymán many abuses crept into the order; as Tash-köpri-záde, who was a contemporary, says, 'in our time an unshorn crew of innovators, the roar of the drum of whose errors and the clangour of the naker of whose effrontery hath ascended to the apogee of the sphere, giving themselves out to be disciples of that Elder of the Path (Hajji Bektash), have made show of discipleship at the shrine of Love (the saint's tomb), and have laid claim to connection with that threshold of miracles,' a claim which the writer vigorously controverts.

to Islâm to whom he was indebted for most of his particulars concerning religious matters. Disinclination to predicate amything of the Divine Essence was not a peculiarly Bektashí characteristic; it was, as we have learned, the usual attitude of the philosophers and higher mystics in presence of the One, an attitude learned from the Neo-Platonists. We know, moreover, that the offence for which Nesímí suffered was quite other than that reported by Rycaut.

Setting aside whatever might be inferred as to the widespread reputation of Nesímí from the circumstance that he alone of the Türkish poets is mentioned by both these foreign writers, it is notable that neither of them seems ever to have heard of the Hurúfí sect, while each represents Nesímí as being claimed by a different dervish-order. From this we may gather, firstly, that the Hurúfís had ceased to be of importance by the middle of the sixteenth century, and secondly, that the fact of Nesímí's connection with that school had by then faded from the popular memory. This last point may perhaps tend to strengthen the conjecture already made that towards the close of his life Nesímí's zeal for Hurúfíism was swallowed up in his enthusiasm for that advanced form of Súfíism which is associated with the name of Mansúr the Wool-carder.

We shall now let Nesímí speak for himself, so far as this is possible through the medium of translation. [1]

Ghazel. [53]

Yea, every dulcet speech o' thine is e'en a pearl of lustrous ray; [2]
Both sun and moon are moths that round thy Face's taper flit and play.

[1] The Díwán of Nesímí was printed in Constantinople, in 1298 (1881), at the printing-office of the newspaper Akhter. There is in my collection a MS. of the Díwán which differs in many places from the printed edition.

[2] Beautiful and wise words are often compared to pearls.

Thy Face is yonder shining orb from whose effulgent radiance 'tis
The flambeaux of the sun and moon do flare with blazing light alway.

O censor,[1] cast thy rosary and prayer-rug afar from thee,
And gaze on yonder curl and mole, and see what snare and grain are they.[2]

The Lovers' Loved One is The Truth, so to The Truth give thou thy life;
For why? — That frame which loveless is shall likewise ever lifeless stay.

Come, hearken to the tale of Love, nor cheated be by fables still;
For every preacher's words who sells the Koran are but fables aye.

Through all eternity no ache or ill from wine of Unity
Will reach that toper of The Truth whose skinker is yon narcisse gay.[3]

The measure[4] of the Wine of Unity is e'en the dearling's lip;
O zealot, make thee drunk from yonder measure, sweet the measure, yea!

Bow down before yon Image of the Merciful, for ne'er repelled
Is man of God who doth yon Image of the Lord adore in fay.[5]

The sage is he who sees his Lord; come, see thy Lord, and sage become;[6]
The alien[7] 'tis, who 'fore The Truth is shamed, that 's Satan-like to-day.

Nesímí in thy musky tresses' chain is bound, O Idol fair;
The madman he who all unfettered by those chains pursues his way.[8]

[1] The 'censor,' like the 'zealot' and the 'legist,' is a type of aggressive conventionality.

[2] The comparison of a beauty's locks to a snare and of her mole to the grain set as bait therein, is common.

[3] The 'narcisse' is of course the beloved's eye; the idea here is that the beauty of the loved one's eye intoxicates the lover, but with a spiritual intoxication that brings no ill.

[4] The measure, i. e. the cup or beaker.

[5] This couplet, in which Nesímí calls upon the reader to adore the Form of his beloved, made in the image of God, is pure Hurúfíism.

[6] Referring to the oft-quoted aphorism: 'Whoso knoweth himself knoweth his Lord.' Nesímí here perverts the true meaning, he bids the reader look on his beloved, there recognise his Lord, and so become a sage.

[7] The 'alien' (to The Truth) is as the 'censor,' the 'zealot' and so on.

[8] In the East, madmen are often chained.

Ghazel. [54]

Lo, thy beauty is the feast-tide, yea, the soul is victim there; [1]
Lo, thy liplet is Life's Fountain, whoso drinks it lives for e'er.

Yea, my heart laid low in ruins is the home of love for thee:
Whence is this that every ruin should a boundless treasure bear? [2]

Thou whose Eyebrow is the faithful's prayer-niche, [3] and whose Face their shrine!
Lo, the Lovers' holy temple is the Lord God's Image fair. [4]

How should zealot or should legist know the mysteries of thy Form? —
'Say thou, God sufficeth!' [5] Whence should every brute the secret share?

Thou whose Eyebrows, Hair and Lashes make the Mother of the Book, [6]
Guide and imám of the faithful is the Koran everywhere. [7]

Art thou spirit, art thou child of Adam, O thou Fairy-Face? —
For that all who view the fashion of thy Form distracted stare.

Yea, thy beauty is the Maker's grace (exalted be His glore!): —
Grace is aye his wonted custom who hath might and power plenare.

[1] Referring to the animals sacrificed at the Qurbán Bayrami or 'Festival of the Sacrifices,' which begins on the 10th. of Zí-l-Hijje.

[2] Buried or hidden treasures are generally spoken of as being concealed amid ancient ruins; because such treasures were frequently found among the ruins of old cities. Here Nesímí pictures his heart as a city laid waste by Love; yet hiding beneath its ruins Love's boundless treasure.

[3] The comparison of the eyebrow, because of its curved shape, to the arched mihráb or prayer-niche in a mosque (see p. 224, n. 1.) is a favourite conceit.

[4] Here the form of the beloved is conceived as the temple of the lover, her face representing the shrine (qibla) and her eyebrow the mihráb.

[5] In the Koran, xiii, 43, and elsewhere, it is written: 'Say, God sufficeth (as witness between me and you).' In the present verse this is thrown in parenthetically.

[6] See p. 339.

[7] As thy eyebrows etc. are the Fátiha, thy person is the Koran, and therefore the guide of the faithful.

O my Lord! yon Gem of purest ray in human Form y-clad;
What the world from whence it cometh? why our mortal shape doth wear?

Though my heart should home midmost thy tangled tresses, — where amiss?
Rizwán's Garth is aye the dwelling whereunto the just repair. [1]

Since in all things manifested shines thy Form, O radiant Sun, [2]
Who hath said, 'The fays are hidden and the houris seen no where.'?

Thou who say'st, 'Uneath 'tis union with the Well-Beloved to win,'
Quit thy 'thou-ness,' cast it from thee; eath thine uneath then and there!

Say what manner flower the rose that I should name it with thy cheek?
Where the garden boasts a smiling rose may with thy Face compare?

Every wight who knows himself and who hath found The Truth is grown
Knower of the Lord, a Sultan he though name of slave he bear. [3]

'Every thing doth perish' save thy Face; [4] there is no doubt thereof;
See this Face, and how it pointeth to that Face's face be ware. [5]

Passion-smit, the heart is fallen dazed within thy tresses' springe;
Wildered and head-giddy reels who falls not in that ambered snare.

'Twas the cursed fiend denied the Image of the Merciful; [6]
Satan he who doth not bow him 'fore 'the Best of Forms' [7] most fair.

O Nesímí, Kevser's water floweth in thy speech belike,
For that all who drink that vintage drunken bide thenceforth for e'er.

[1] The beloved's rosy face encircled by her tangled tresses is Rizwán's Garth, i. e. Paradise.

[2] It is the beloved who is thus addressed.

[3] Another allusion to the aphorism mentioned p. 360, n. 6.

[4] This is the Koranic text quoted on page 353.

[5] i. e. look on the beloved's Face and see how this points to (reveals) the face (aspect) of the Face (Essence) of God.

[6] This couplet refers of course to the legend of Satan's refusal to worship Adam.

[7] This phrase is taken from the Koranic text quoted p. 338, n. 2.

Ghazel. [55]

Thou whose Face is 'Aid from God!' O thou whose Hair is 'Victory near!'[1]
Thou the Merciful in human Form![2] thou angel-visage dear!

Wildered I before thy beauty, thou whose locks the basil rile;
Yea, the Paradisal basil is thy jacinth's perfume sheer.

Curl and cheek o' thine stand there, the Lord 'ascended on the Throne;'[3]
Thou whose eyebrow is the Ka'ba-niche, whose eye the preacher here.

Bare the Secret of thine ambergris-diffusing locks is laid;
Come is God's own Spirit, abrogate are cross and monkish gear.[4]

Gabriel[5] hath revealed the Scripture on the tablet of thy Form,
Thou whose beauty is the Word of God; 'a wondrous thing is here!'[6]

'Tis the sage who knows The Truth who doth the Lover's Secrets know;
How should he who ne'er hath known himself know aught anent his fere?[7]

Whosoe'er is sick a-yearning for those azure eyes of thine, —
Lo, his leech thy Jesus-speech,[8] his draught thy dulcet liplet dear.

Zealot, seek not thou to stay me from the love of beauties bright;
For The Truth made Love my portion in the Fore-eternal Year.[9]

[1] Koran, lxi, 13, 'Aid from God and victory near!' The connection between the beloved's hair and 'victory near' is not apparent.

[2] Here Nesímí says in so many words that the beloved is God incarnate.

[3] This is the favourite Hurúfí text mentioned p. 337, n. 3. Why it should be quoted in connection with the beloved's curl and cheek is not apparent, unless these be taken to represent the face.

[4] Formal religions are abrogated now that the Spirit has made manifest the truth, just as Christianity was superseded when Gabriel revealed the Koran.

[5] Gabriel, the angel of revelation, brought down the Koran to Muhammed.

[6] This last phrase is an Arabic quotation, but not from the Koran.

[7] Yet another allusion to the aphorism, 'Whoso knoweth himself knoweth his Lord.'

[8] Jesus, who healed the sick and raised the dead, is the type of the perfect physician.

[9] 'The Fore-eternal Year' (literally, 'the Fore-eternal Day') is here synonymous with 'the Day of E-lest,' 'the Day of the Primal Compact' (see p. 22), the meaning being that before time was, God destined me to love beauties, and therefore it is vain to seek to stop me.

Prate not, schoolman,[1] of thy schoolmanship to them of Unity;
Hold thy peace! for why? — the schoolman weets not of Love's lore or cheer.

Yea, thy Face is Eden's flowery garden, doubt thereof is none,
Thou within whose garth are Rizwán and God's Spirit bulbuls clear.[2]

O Nesímí, since thy rival is thy love, to wit is God,
One are wrath and grace, and one likewise thy rival and thy dear.[3]

Ghazel. [56]

Since from yonder lunar Visage now the veil is cast aside,
Lo! the glorious sun is risen and of gloom is past the tide.

Yea, inebriate[4] are all things from the wine-cup of thy lip;
Bravo! O pure-hearted skinker, be thy potion sanctified!

Thou for longing for whose cheek in Heaven's heart there burns a flame!
Thou for sherbet of whose lip in Kevser's eye[5] doth water bide!

Thou for whose bright cheek's red rose the tulip's cup with wine is filled!
Thou the wine of yearning for whose eye with-sleep the narcisse plied![6]

[1] The 'schoolman,' another of the 'zealot' family.

[2] Rizwán, who is the warden of Paradise, and the Spirit of God sing as nightingales in that garden which is thy fair face.

[3] This line cannot be satisfactorily translated as the point lies in the double sense of the word raqíb, which means (1) 'a guardian,' 'one who watches over another,' and is so applied to God in the Koran; (2) 'the rival of a lover,' such being held to be ever on the watch concerning the movements of the beloved and her other lovers. Here Nesímí says that since God is at once his raqíb { 'guardian' / 'rival' } and his beloved, wrath (the attribute of the rival) and grace (the attribute of the guardian and beloved) are identical.

[4] The 'inebriation' or 'drunkenness' so frequently spoken of in these and similar poems is of course the inebriation of mystic ecstasy, just as the 'drunkards' or 'topers' are the mystic ecstatics.

[5] The word here rendered 'eye' means also 'fount,' and so gives an untranslatable íhám or amphibology. The cheek of the beloved, being red, suggests the flame; her lip, being what is 'drunk' or 'sipped' (i. e. kissed), suggests the water.

[6] The narcissus, drooping on its stalk, is often spoken of as languishing or sleepful.

That thy Form, — it is the comment on the Word of God Most High;
Thou whose Face is 'We have opened,' yea, a door by God oped wide. [1]

True, thine Eyebrows, Hair and Lashes are the Book of God; [2] to him
Who doth know that Book 'with him is knowledge of the Book' [3] 's applied.

Whoso knoweth not the charácts writ upon that Form o' thine,
Knoweth not the tale of prayer or fast or of the Reckoning-tide. [4]

That thy lip is e'en Life's Fountain, that thy breath the Holy Spright,
That thy Visage is God's Image; 'and God knoweth best' [5] beside.

Sure, thy lip unto the Lover Granter of all Needs [6] must be,
Seeing to whate'er he prayeth, 'I will answer,' [7] is replied.

On the road to reach the Loved One is duality the veil;
Ne'er till 'I-ness' is uprooted is the curtain drawn aside.

O Nesímí, bow thee down before yon Moon; for God to thee
'Worship those my signs, adore, and draw thee nigh!' [8] aloud hath cried.

Ghazel. [57]

'I am The Truth!' I ceaseless cry, for Mansúr-like Truth-helped I be!
A bulwark to this city I, who then were fain to gibbet me!

I am the Shrine of all the True, the Loved One of the Lover-crew,
The Mansúr of the worthy few, the Heavenly Ka'ba, [9] verily!

[1] Koran, xlviii, 1. 'Verily, We have opened for thee an obvious opening,' (meaning, We have given thee an obvious victory). The connection here is not very apparent; perhaps it is got at through the meaning of Fátiha (lit. 'Opener'), by which term, as we know, the Hurúfís often designate the face.

[2] See p. 339.

[3] This phrase occurs in the Koran, xiii, 43.

[4] i. e. he does not understand the truths symbolized by prayer, fasting, the Judgment-Day, etc. See p. 339.

[5] The Arabic phrase quoted p. 298, n. 1.

[6] Qází-ul-Háját, 'the Satisfier of (all) Needs,' a title of God.

[7] The phrase 'I will answer' is from this passage of the Koran, xl, 62, 'And your Lord said: Call upon me, I will answer you.'

[8] From Koran, xcvi, 19, 'Nay, obey him not, but adore and draw nigh.'

[9] i. e. the 'Frequented House,' which is visited by the angels. See p. 37.

I'm Moses, for with God alway I parley and hold converse sweet;
My heart 's Epiphany's Sinai, so I'm Sinai in verity. [1]

I've won th' Ascension [2] of yon Eyebrows twain the which 'two bow-lengths' tells; [3]
Behold me upon Union's night, from head to foot a radiancy. [4]

I quaffed the Wine of Unity long since at the Primeval Feast, [5]
And drunken with that draught grew I thenceforth to all eternity.

O Sun, thy Face is 'By the light!' and thy black Hair is 'By the night!' [6]
Thy lip hath healed my sickened spright, — and that the dolour that I dree!

What way soe'er I turn my face, I see the Loved One in that place;
That I have grieved of grief for thee is all of my felicity.

That Beauty Unbeheld am I, for I am One with all that is;
That Word of the Divine am I, for in the heart they hymn to me.

In that my being is the glass where show the eighteen thousand worlds, [7]
I am the Image of the Lord, veiled 'fore the base plebeity. [8]

[1] God's revelation of Himself to Moses, and Mount Sinai, the scene of that revelation, are constantly referred to by the mystic poets.

[2] The word here used, Miʿráj, is that specially applied to the famous 'Ascension' or 'Night-Journey' of the Prophet.

[3] In the Koran, liii, 19, we have, 'Then he drew near and hovered o'er! until he was two bow-lengths off or nigher still!' These words refer to the nearness of the Archangel Gabriel's approach to Muhammed when he was bringing him the revelation. They are however often quoted as though they referred to the Prophet's near approach to God on the night of the Ascension. Nesímí's idea seems to be that he has learned the mystery symbolized by the beloved's eyebrows which has brought him as close to God as was the Prophet on the Ascension-Night. It is further inferred that the Koranic phrase 'two bow-lengths' really indicates the two eyebrows of the beloved, which are of course shaped like bows.

[4] As the Prophet was clothed in splendour on the Ascension-Night when he was brought into close communion with God.

[5] See pp. 22-3.

[6] In the Koran, xciii, 1-2, God swears 'By the Morning Light! And by the Night when it darkeneth!' Here Nesímí would make out that the Divine oath is really by the bright face and dark hair of the beloved. The 'Sun' addressed is of course the beloved.

[7] i. e. the whole universe which, according to the tradition, consists of

I am that Hidden Treasure's [1] mystery made manifest to all;
I am that Essence now revealed like to the sun for all to see.

As I Nesímí am the Essence, I to you my hoards disclose;
A ruin treasure-fraught am I,[2] behold my fair prosperity!

Almost all Nesímí's quatrains are rhymed in what is called the musarra[c] manner, that is, the third line rhymes with the others. [3]

Rubá[c]í. [58]

Thou for love of whose fair Face doth reel the Sphere,
Yonder Face o' thine the angel-hosts revere.
Doubtless this, thou hast in beauty ne'er a peer;
'Tis the touchstone proves the coin of every fere.

Rubá[c]í. [59]

Thou who lookest everywhere The Truth to see,
In thyself abides The Truth, yea, e'en in thee.
Ne'er the faithless shall the Prophets' Secret see;
Such sweet-savoured wine is not the demon's fee.

Rubá[c]í. [60]

From The Truth I'm come; 'I am The Truth!' I cry.
Truth am I, The Truth is in me, Truth I cry.
Look ye how these mysteries uncouth I cry.
Sooth am I, and all the words are sooth I cry.

18,000 worlds. See p. 54. Man is the microcosm reflecting and summing up in himself all the Divine Attributes, i. e. all that is.

[8] The meaning seems to be that I, being man, am the microcosm, the epitome of the macrocosm of external nature, and the sum of the Divine Attributes, and am therefore the Image of God, though the vulgar cannot perceive this.

[1] The 'Hidden Treasure' so often referred to. See pp. 16-7.

[2] See p. 361, n. 2.

[3] See p. 88. n. 2.

Rubá'í. [61]

Plunged have I amid the Sea that shore hath none;
Fall'n am I upon the Pain that cure hath none;
Seen have I the Moon which hath nor fleck nor flaw;
Found have I the Treasure-hoard that store hath none.

Rubá'í. [62]

Tired and weary of the wordly folk my heart;
Up from sleep of heedlessness awoke my heart;
Shamed of having hurt The Truth, is broke my heart;
Now unto The Truth alone doth look my heart.

Rubá'í. [63]

Come and plunge thee deep beneath Love's ocean-tide,
Mid the Secret of the Unity abide.
Be not Satan, fall not into guile and pride;
Bow to Adam, cast thy haughty thoughts aside.

Rubá'í. [64]

Verily, The Truth in every thing I see;
Lose not thou The Truth unless no thing thou be.
Whoso knoweth not The Truth, a rebel he.
Come, for lo, the flood hath swept thy barque from thee.

Rubá'í. [65]

God Most High as very son of man is seen.
Thirty-two the Words are of God's Speech, I ween. [1]
Know that all the universe is God's own Self.
Man is yonder Soul whose Face the sun is e'en.

[1] The 'Thirty-two Words' of God are probably the thirty-two letters of the Perso-Arabic alphabet. See p. 340.

Of Refí'í, the disciple of Nesímí, absolutely nothing is known beyond what may be gathered from his own poem. The Ottoman biographers and historians, so far as I have been able to see, ignore him completely. It may be that when the later Hurúfí writings, such as the Istiwá-Náme, come to be examined in detail, some allusion to him may be found, though up till now these have contributed nothing to the very little we know concerning him. We are therefore compelled, for the present at any rate, to fall back on Refí'í's own work, though little indeed regarding the author is to be learned there.

Towards the end of his poem, which, as we have already seen, is entitled Besháret-Náme or 'The Book of Glad Tidings,' Refí'í tells us that before Nesímí became his guide and director,[1] he had been wandering as one whose head reels, unable to determine what to believe or what to think, and every day taking up with some new doctrine. His 'I-ness' had been a veil before him; and although he was versed

[1] On the margins of the British Museum MS. of the Besháret-Náme are numerous glosses citing the passage from the Kóran, the Hadís or the Súfí aphorism alluded to in the text, or at least illustrated by it. Thus, against these lines about the author's master we have the following Arabic sentences, the first of which is a current saying of the Súfís, while the second is a proverb:— لَو لَا مَنٌّ بِی مَا عَرَفْتُ رَبِّی 'Had He not been gracious unto me, I had not known my Lord.' مَنْ عَلَّمَنِی حَرْفًا فَقَدْ صَیَّرَنِی عَبْدًا 'Whoso hath taught me a letter hath made me his slave.' This second, which is intended to show the great value of learning, is specially appropriate in the mouth of a Hurúfí, as it figures learning by a 'letter.'

in various sciences, these had not enabled him to judge between false and true.[1] Now he would be a Sunní (orthodox Muslim), now a philosopher; sometimes it was metempschycosis, sometimes materialism, that won his favour; then again he would speak as the Súfí sheykhs and treat with contempt all mundane things. Thus unable to find satisfaction in any system, he travelled along every road; and whenever he heard of a learned man, he knew no rest until he had sought him out and 'searched his soul from end to end;' but for all that he could do, he still remained unsatisfied.[2] At length, he was taught what means the 'grace of God,' and taught by that Zephyr[3] of mercy from the 'Grace of God,' by him who seeth man alike with the bodily and the spiritual eye, by that Martyr of the love of the 'Grace' of the *All*-Glorious, who, though he hath lain for months and years in bonds, hath never complained of his sufferings or concealed the Mysteries that ought to be declared.[4] When this Nesímí declared unto him the meaning of the Grace of God, the veil was rent, and his darkness was turned into light; for this teacher was to him as Khizr proffering the Water of

[1] A marginal gloss to this passage cites Koran, xxviii, 56: 'Verily thou canst not guide whom thou dost like; but God guideth whom He pleaseth; for He best knoweth who are to be guided.'

[2] The marginal gloss here is from Koran, xiv, 31: 'And the likeness of an evil word is as an evil tree, which is felled from above the earth, and hath no staying-place.'

[3] The word Nesím means 'Zephyr;' so the name Nesímí might mean 'He of the Zephyr.'

[4] We have here two glosses. One is from the Koran, iii, 25: 'Thou honourest whom Thou pleasest, and Thou abasest whom Thou pleasest; in Thy hand is good. Verily, Thou art mighty over all.' The other is this Hadís-i Qudsí, or Tradition in which God is the speaker: مَنْ عَشِقَنِی عَشِقْتُهُ وَ مَنْ عَشِقْتُهُ قَتَلْتُهُ وَ مَنْ قَتَلْتُهُ فَأَنَا دِيَتُهُ 'Whoso loveth me, him I love; and whom I love, him I slay; and whom I slay, verily I am his Blood-wit.' Mr. Browne says this Tradition is constantly cited in the Mahabbet-Náme.

Life, which he took and drank, and lo, all his difficulties passed away and the enigmas of the Koran became clear. Then Nesímí bade him go and teach the truth to the people of Rúm, expounding unto them those Mysteries. It was thus needful for him to speak in Turkish; so he laboured for some days and produced this Besháret-Náme, which was finished on the first Friday of the Fast (i. e. of Ramazán) of the year 811 (18th. Jany. 1409).

Thus all we know of Refí'í is that he was an earnest seeker after God, that he was persuaded of the truth of the doctrines of the 'Grace of God' (i. e. Fazl-ulláh) by Nesímí, and that at the bidding of that teacher he wrote on these same doctrines a Turkish poem, entitled Besháret-Náme which was finished early in 811 (1409).

The Besháret-Náme is a comparatively short work,[1] and is in mesneví verse. The metre is that of 'Ashiq's Gharíb-Náme and other old mesnevís, and the prosody is by no means always accurate. The style is prosaic in the extreme, and it is rare indeed that any flash of poetry lights up the dull and obscure pages. The work is merely a versified treatise on the Hurúfí doctrines; and most probably was written in verse simply for the reasons mentioned in an earlier chapter, namely, that it was then the custom to clothe religious and philosophic thought in verse, and that in Turkish it was easier to write in verse than in prose, which as yet was hardly formed.

The Besháret-Náme is marked by the same complete absence of method or system of arrangement which characterises almost all the writings of those Eastern transcendentalists. The author begins by discoursing on the virtues of the 'Names,' which, however, are themselves composed of the Letters;

[1] As there is a gap between the folios numbered 19 and 20 in the British Museum MS., I am unable to state the precise length of the poem.

so the 'Thirty-Two [1] Letters' are the elements of all the Names, and consequently of all existent things; a saying which, he adds, comes from the Prophets, so there can be no mistake about it. The Letters then are the roots of Speech, which is really uttered Thought, and therefore eternal and undying as God Himself. The Word (i. e. Thought) of God is not distinct from God Himself, as speech is not other than the speaker. The Word of God is the source of all things, uncreated and eternal, first and last, hidden and manifest. So if we take this Word away from things, there remains no trace of any thing. This Word is then the essence of being, therefore we must try to understand it.

Now in Man are made manifest all the Names, [2] so in Man we shall find the Prophets and the Truth, for in him are all things hidden and manifest. He is at once the centre of the universe and the builder thereof, its cynosure and its monarch. All things in existence are his, as is the kingdom alike of the highest and the lowest. Whoever then can find the Way to that Word which is made manifest in Man shall be delivered from the anguish of 'Thou shalt not see Me;' [3] and whoso knoweth the truth concerning Man can like Jesus raise the dead to life. The greatest of all things is the Throne (ʿArsh) of God, that Throne whereupon He ascended when He

[1] Throughout the MS., wherever the sacred words 'thirty-two' would occur, they are replaced by a symbol something like ٥٢. The signification of this symbol is given in a marginal note on folio 3 b.

[2] See p. 62. The gloss here is Koran, ii, 29: 'And He taught Adam the names, all of them.'

[3] The gloss here is Koran, vii, 139, where God, in answer to the request of Moses that He would show Himself to him, says: '"Thou shalt not see Me; but look upon the mountain, and if it remain steady in its place, thou shalt see Me;" but when his Lord appeared unto the mountain He made it dust, and Moses fell down aswoon.' Compare Exodus, xxxiii, 18-23.

All the saints yearn for the sight of God; Reffiʿí would say that His Word, i. e. Thought, i. e. Essence, is made manifest in Man, and that therefore whoso has eyes to see Man as he really is, has attained to the bliss of beholding God.

had finished the work of creation, and the Prophet hath said that the Heart of the Believer is the Throne of God, and again that the Heart of the Believer is the House of God; [1] but there is naught in the Heart except the Word. So Man is the Throne and God is the Word; this is the creed of all the Prophets. The wise and holy have said that the Heart is the place whereinto descend the Mysteries of God; so if thou would seek God, O beloved, seek Him in the crumbling tomb of the broken Heart. [2]

A little farther on Refí'í dilates on the virtues and mysteries of the human Face. In the Face of Man, he says, are made clear the meaning of the pilgrimage and of prayer; whoever hath seen and understood that Face hath looked upon and read the Being of God. 'Ope thine eye,' he cries, 'look into the Face of Man, that thou be not far from the Glorious Truth.' Man, formed of dust, is the life of the world, and the knowledge of him the medicine for heart's ills. Whoso looketh on the Visage of Man perceiveth the secrets of the Eighteen Thousand Worlds. [3] He hath four rows of eye-

[1] On the margin are quoted the Hadíses, قَلْبُ ٱلْمُؤْمِنِ بَيْتُ ٱللّٰهِ 'The heart of the believer is the house of God,' and قَلْبُ ٱلْمُؤْمِنِ عَرْشُ ٱللّٰهِ 'The heart of the believer is the throne of God,' and لَا يَسَعُنِي أَرْضِي وَلَا سَمَائِي بَلْ يَسَعُنِي قَلْبُ ٱلْعَبْدِ ٱلْمُؤْمِنِ 'My earth containeth Me not, neither doth My heaven; but the heart of My believing servant containeth Me.'

[2] This Tradition, in which God is the speaker, is quoted on the margin: اُطْلُبْنِي عِنْدَ ٱلْقُلُوبِ ٱلْمُنْكَسِرَةِ وَ ٱلْقُبُورِ ٱلْمُنْدَرِسَةِ 'Seek Me in the broken hearts and by the crumbling tombs.'

[3] The margin bears this Hadís: سَتَرَوْنَ رَبَّكُمْ كَمَا تَرَوْنَ ٱلْقَمَرَ لَيْلَةَ ٱلْبَدْرِ يَوْمَ ٱلْقِيٰمَةِ 'Ye shall see your Lord even as ye see the moon on the

lashes, two eyebrows, and one mass of hair, seven in all, and these are called the Mother of the Book. The cheeks and the nose (i. e. each nostril, or each side of the nose) yield four lines, which, with three more for the lips (perhaps the two lips and the line between them) give other seven; that is fourteen lines altogether in the human Face. Double this, and there is twenty-eight (the number of the letters in the Arabic alphabet); but know that no demon can understand these mysteries! To these fourteen lines answer another fourteen, namely the Fourteen Letters of the Koran, [1] which Letters are the Attributes of God, and are undying like His Essence. Like Him, they are immanent in all things; for His uncreated Word holds the Kingdom of things. [2]

Refí'í next proceeds to interpret in Hurúfí fashion the Koranic text, 'And the moon is split asunder.' [3] The hair, he says, is not to be reckoned (in this case) as one, but as two, for Abraham parted it, and Muhammed's own tresses bear witness to this. [4] Now if the hair be parted, a straight

night when it is full, on the Resurrection-Day.' And equally clearly can ye see your Lord in the human face, — is the Hurúfí inference.

[1] i. e. the detached letters which stand at the beginning of certain chapters of the Koran. There are fourteen of these letters, and they occur in fourteen different combinations.

[2] Of course the 'uncreated Word of God' really means the Logos, i. e. the Divine Thought and Word regarded as two aspects of one entity; but ignorant people took the phrase literally and understood by it the Koran, whence the notion held by some that that book is uncreated and eternal.

[3] Koran, liv, 1. There are two explanations of this passage. The one is, that the unbelievers having asked for a sign, the Prophet pointed his finger at the moon which straightway appeared split asunder, — a legend which, though not generally believed, is often referred to by the poets. The second and more usual explanation is that it refers to one of the signs which are to herald the Last Day.

[4] Abraham is credited with the establishment of various practices, such as paring the nails, using a toothpick, and parting the hair, which Muhammed is said to have followed, declaring them to have been the customs of that patriarch.

line is seen, this is the Way of God, what is called 'the Right Way,'[1] the which unless one travel, he shall never behold the vision of delight. Again, there is a line between the lips, part these like the hair; thus (in two ways) the meaning of the 'splitting of the moon' becometh clear.

Farther on in his work, Refí'í has a panegyric on Fazl-ulláh the founder of his sect. Whatsoever existeth, he says, is but the Divine Ṇames; but the Most Great Name is he, he who showed to us the true path. All that existeth is the Word, but the Sultan of the Word is he, to wit, Fazl-ulláh, the Grace of God, the Lord of the Worlds, he to whose Jávidán-Náme the poet refers the reader for proofs of what he has just advanced.

Farther on still, and near the end of the book, occurs the passage in which Refí'í speaks of himself and tells how he had gone on seeking for truth now in one belief, now in another, till he met Nesímí who by expounding to him the Hurúfí mysteries had set his doubts at rest, and then bidden him place the truth within the reach of the people of Rúm by writing in the Turkish language a book explaining the tenets of their sect. The result of this injunction is the Besháret-Náme, concerning which its author says that though in outward appearance but a small compendium, in reality it is worthy of the highest esteem; for 'hast thou, O beloved, understood what glad news (besháret) it giveth? In it the Essence of the Creator is become known, the promise of the Prophets is fulfilled, the 'Grace' of the Unsleeping One is made manifest, the Hidden Secret is spoken openly, the riddle of the Four Books[2] is solved.' A few lines farther on

[1] The Koran, xi, 59, is quoted on the margin: 'There is no beast but He taketh it by its forelock; verily, my Lord is on the right way.' To the Hurúfí the 'forelock' suggests the hair; the 'right way,' the parting.

[2] 'The Four Books,' i. e. the Pentateuch, the Psalms, the Gospel and the Koran.

Refí'í mentions his sources; he says, 'There are here from the words of the 'Arsh-Náme; I have translated these that they may remain a souvenir, I have written in Turkish many couplets therefrom; think not I have strayed from the path * * * Most of it (the Besháret-Náme) is the word of the Jávidán-Náme; whoso understandeth it will become the greatest of the world. I have also taken sayings from the Mahabbet-Náme. It hath been accomplished from the Three Books of The Truth.'

The work closes with a supplication to God whom Refí'í prays for the sake of Muhammed and Jesus and Noah and Abraham and Moses, and for that of the Koran, the Gospel, the Pentateuch, the Psalms and the Jávidán-Náme to make him of His true lovers and faithful servants, to admit him to all the mysteries, and if there be any errors in his book, to pardon them of His mercy; and further, for the sake of the Prophets, to forgive his sins and shortcomings, seeing how he seeketh neither wealth nor power nor any earthly good, but only to be reckoned among His servants. And last of all he prays God to manifest His Grace (Fazl).

In the printed edition of Nesímí's Díwán [1] is inserted a Turkish mesneví poem of 144 couplets over which is the title: Genj-Náme li-Mevláná Refí'í or 'The Book of the Treasure by Our Lord Refí'í.' The metre of this poem is a graceful variety of the hezej [2] which, though destined to brilliant service in the future, had not up till this time been used in Western Turkish. From a literary point of view the Genj-Náme is much superior to the Besháret-Náme, the versification is smoother, the phraseology more polished. The poem is less of a Hurúfí text-book; in many places it reads like an ordinary Súfí effusion, though the author's peculiar

[1] pp. 9-14.

[2] – – ∪ | ∪ – ∪ – | ∪ – – || – – ∪ | ∪ – ∪ – | ∪ – –

tenets, which underlie the whole, often crop up through the surface.

The poem opens with a glowing apostrophe to Man conceived under a double aspect, namely, in Hurúfí fashion as incarnate Divinity, and in the manner of the philosophers as the goal to which all nature tends. The reader is then called on to learn of Fazl (-ulláh) and Ahmed (the Prophet Muhammed); for whoever taketh these two as guides, unto him will the mysteries of the Four Books be revealed, He who knoweth himself knoweth God; he entereth into Paradise, and wherever he turn his eyes, he seeth the Beloved; he findeth the totality of things in himself, and he is Sultan in this world and that. Such an one is a 'living Khizr;' for he hath penetrated to the Most Great Blackness, [1] and there hath drunk of the Water of Life. He can therefore walk the waters and fly through the air, and can traverse all time and space in the twinkling of an eye; he holdeth converse with all things, and by his breath can wake the dead to life. Whomsoever such a 'living Khizr' toucheth he maketh like unto himself, unfolding to him all mysteries and laying bare the meanings of rites and ceremonies. The reader is bidden seek out such a Khizr that his eyes be opened and he see the Beatific Vision. Thanks to the aid of Fazl (-ulláh), those Khizrs are now to be found in every corner; but it is only the noble and the free who will seek them, the base-souled desire not such things.

If the Lover be not of ill-repute among men, he is held by the initiates to be but immature. [2] He must turn his

[1] Sewád-i A'zam, 'the Most Great Blackness,' the annihilation of selfhood: the 'dazzling darkness,' that effulgence of the Godhead which veils It from sight.

[2] As said Juneyd of Baghdad, a great Súfí saint who died in 298 (910-1):
لَا يَبْلُغُ أَحَدٌ دَرَجَةَ ٱلْحَقِيقَةِ حَتَّى يَشْهَدَ فِيهِ أَلْفُ صِدِّيقٍ بِأَنَّهُ

back upon the world; if he seek the Paradise of Light, he must pass from this dark earth and spread his pinions for Heavenward flight, he must wing his way to the Spirit World, leaving all mean desire behind him here.

None the less (and here the Hurúfí speaks) he who is blind in this world will be unable to see in the Other; if one cannot perceive the Beloved here, he will not behold Him in the Hereafter. What appeareth manifest There is to be seen by glimpses here. Paradise, the houris, the angels, the Bridge, the Balance, all are here; so one must enter into Paradise here that he may find his way to it There. If one hath not been distraught by the beloved here, how shall he be comforted by the Beloved There? This is the field, and what one soweth now he shall reap hereafter.

The reader is then called on to study the pictures presented by the phenomenal world and learn how the Painter and His pictures are both eternal. Then he may plant his banner above the heavens; for in that realm first and last, hidden and manifest, all are one. There in that Spirit World he may drink with Rizwán from the Paradisal fountains and walk with houris hand in hand. There is the palace of all delight, and there are myriad gardens glorious with every loveliest flower and vocal with the sweetest notes of nightingale and dove. And whoso would attain to this felicity, let him cast aside all pride, bow down to Man, and so be merged and whelmed in God.

All the Prophets tell us that every perfection is (latent) within the soul, so we must be heedful that we be not slaves of the flesh. If we have knowledge of the things of this world, these will tell us of the Unseen World. Now

زِنْدِيق 'No one attaineth to the degree of Truth until a thousand righteous men bear witness that he is an atheist.'

Man is Sultan in Either World, and the cure of the soul's ill; we are bidden look in his face and see the Image of God; and whosoever knoweth this knoweth everything that is; so whoso boweth not down before Man is rejected, while the angels and the spheres are the slaves of him who doth.

Whatever is within the veil of Thought is circumscribed within the Letters. The Two-and-Seventy Sects [1] are whelmed within the ocean of the Letters; but not one of them all understandeth, not one hath found the road to this city. If the gnostic find the way to those Letters, he will comprehend himself and God. It is they who are become the familiars of this Mystery who have learned the Most Great Name, [2] and through that Name they know all Names, and win to the heart's desire; and to every one to whom they give to drink, they proffer the Water of Life.

Then Refí'í, repeating what he says in the Besháret-Náme, declares that when those enlightened ones cured his ill the

[1] 'The Two-and-Seventy Sects' is a current phrase for the sects of Islam. It arose from the following saying traditionally attributed to the Prophet: تَفَرَّقُ أُمَّتِي عَلَى ثَلٰثٍ وَ سَبْعِينَ مِلَّةً كُلُّهُم فِي ٱلنَّارِ إِلَّا مِلَّةً وَاحِدَةً 'My people shall be divided into three-and-seventy sects, and all of them shall be in the Fire save one sect.' On being asked which that one sect would be, the Prophet answered: مَا أَنَا عَلَيْهِ وَ أَصْحَابِي 'That to which belong I and my Companions.' Naturally, every sect in Islam identifies itself with this one, which is called the Firqa-i Nájíye 'the sect that will be saved,' in contradistinction to the Firqa-i Hálike 'the sect that will perish,' which embraces all the other seventy-two. The phrase 'the two-and-seventy sects' thus properly means only the heretical sects of Islam, though it is frequently employed as embracing all, heretical and orthodox alike. The Prophet is likewise said to have foretold that the Jews would be split up into seventy-one sects, and the Christians into seventy-two.

[2] Ism-i A'zam, the 'Most Great Name (of God),' the mightiest Power in existence. It was graven on the Seal of Solomon, who by virtue thereof controlled all creatures and all the forces of nature. It is described as that Name which sums up and includes all the other Names; and by some is said to be Alláh, i. e. 'The God.'

hidden secrets were unveiled before him. We had been, he says, as it were, dead, and we found life; we had been in prison and we found deliverance. When we found that Zephyr (Nesímí) of the Bounteous One, that was the mercy of the Merciful to us; we drained one draught of his wine, and we forgot what sorrow was; we learned what are the secrets of this City, we understood what are the mysteries of the universe. The poet finally bids the reader come and learn of him, for he is now the pearl in the ocean of existent things, the centre of the universe of the Divine Attributes. The advantages of following this course are set forth, but the would-be pilgrim is warned against setting out on the endless road without a trusty guide. 'If, however,' adds the poet, 'Refí'í be thy guide, thou shall attain thy heart's desire.'

Hurúfíism produced no other poets of any note; but the sect lived on till at least the middle of the seventeenth century. I have found only two notices concerning it in the Turkish chronicles, and both of these point to the hatred and persecution which was apparently the usual lot of its adherents.

The first of these notices is in the Crimson Peony where Tash-köpri-záde in his account of Mevláná Fakhr-ud-Dín-i ᶜAjemí, the Persian doctor who in 834 (1430-1) succeeded Mevláná Fenárí [1] as Muftí of the capital, relates as creditable to the pious zeal of that legal guardian of orthodoxy the following instance of ferocious fanaticism. [2] There were at the court of Sultan Mehemmed II at Adrianople certain Hurúfís who had contrived to ingratiate themselves with the monarch and to induce him to listen attentively to their expositions of their doctrine. Mehemmed, who was interested in philosophical and literary matters, treated these sectaries with great courtesy and consideration, even going so far as to appoint special apartments in his palace for their use. Such marks of the imperial favour roused the suspicions, if not the jealousy of the Grand Vezir Mahmúd Pasha, who

[1] See p. 261, n. 1. Fenárí was the first, Fakhr-ud-Dín the second Muftí of the capital; the latter, who was a pupil of the famous Seyyid Sheríf-i Jurjání died in 865 (1460-1), and is buried at Adrianople.

[2] The story is repeated by ᶜAlí and by Rifᶜat Efendi in his history of the Sheykhs of Islam, entitled Devhat-ul-Meshá'ikh or 'The Tree of the Sheykhs.'

cast about for some means whereby he might remove the obnoxious favourites. He bethought him to call in the aid of Fakhr-ud-Dín, the official head of the Law, to whom he represented the danger of allowing the Sultan's mind to be poisoned by the pernicious notions of such pestilent heretics. But before deciding, the Muftí wished to hear for himself what the Hurúfís had to say; so it was arranged that the Vezir should invite the sectaries to a banquet and inquire of them concerning their doctrine, while the Muftí, hidden behind a curtain, would be able to hear all, without the heretics guessing his presence. This plan was carried out; and the Hurúfís, being led to imagine that Mahmúd was favourably inclined towards them, spoke freely, one point leading on to another, till the subject of the Theophany in man [1] was reached. This was too much for the Muftí; as Tash-köpri-záde says, 'the pot of his wrath boiled over with the fire of zeal,' he dashed from his hiding-place and began to curse and revile the astonished speaker. The latter, terrified at the furious apparition, fled from the Vezir's house and made for the palace. Thither the Muftí followed him, seizing him in the very presence of the Sultan, (who apparently had not the courage to protect his client), whence he dragged him to the Mosque of the Three Galleries. [2] He thereupon bade the mu'ezzins summon the people to the mosque,

[1] In the original, Hulúl, i. e. 'the immanence of God in creation,' a general Súfí idea but strained by the Hurúfís and the sect called Hulúlíye to mean more especially the immediate Theophany presented through the fair, whence they deduced the lawfulness of contemplating such (while according to the canon, women should be veiled in public), to which the Hurúfís at any rate, added the obligation to worship such as being incarnations of the Divinity.

[2] The Uch Shurfeli Jámi[c] or 'Mosque of the Three Galleries' (the 'galleries' here meant are the external galleries on a minaret whence the mu'ezzin gives the call to worship) is one of the oldest mosques in Adrianople, having been built by Murád II. It has four minarets, which are reputed to be the highest in the world.

and on their assembling, he mounted the pulpit and denounced the Hurúfís and their blasphemies, declaring that it was needful they should die, and that whoever lent his aid in accomplishing their death would in Heaven be rewarded with a great reward. So the luckless Hurúfís were taken from the mosque to the Oratory [1] and there burned. It is related that the Muftí, who in his frantic zeal was blowing the fatal fire, approached so close to this that the flames caught the long beard for which he was famous.

The second glimpse that we get of the Hurúfís is in the pages of Latífí. Among the poets whom this writer has entered in his Tezkire is an obscure versifier called Temennáyí; and it is noteworthy how the biographer who is so courteous to Nesímí has none but hard words for this accursed heretic, — a fact which may perhaps strengthen the idea that Latífí and the other writers who speak so fondly of that poet did not regard him as at heart a follower of Fazl-ulláh. Concerning this Temennáyí, Latífí says but little; we are told that he came from the neighbourhood of Qaysaríya, that he was a qalender or wandering mendicant dervish, [2] and that he was one of those blasphemers who say that man groweth as the grass and dieth as the grass. He made a collection of books about the Hurúfí doctrine and about metempsychosis, and gathered around him a band of materialists and heretics 'upon each and all of whom be the curse of God!' These reprobates used to declare that man is the Macrocosm and the theatre wherein God displayeth Himself, and so whenever they saw a beauty they used to bow down in adoration, saying: —

[1] The name Musallá or 'Oratory' is given to a large open enclosed space outside a town, where worship is performed on occasions when the congregation would be too large to be accomodated in any of the mosques.

[2] See p. 357, n. 1.

'O thou Idol, theatre of God art thou!
'Perfect compend of the Word of God art thou!' [1]

And so they walked in the ways of Satan, and held all forbidden and questionable things for lawful. And by an unreasonable interpretation of their own they found everything that is in the scriptures in the human form; moreover, they reckoned it martyrdom to die for their blasphemies, and took as their watchword this quatrain of their master Fazl-ulláh: —

'In the kitchen of Love except the fair they slay not.
'Those lean-souls, [2] — the loathly spirits there they slay not.
'So thou be Lover true, from slaughter fly not.
'Unclean in sooth is whosoe'er they slay not.' [3]

In the time of Sultan Báyezíd, adds Latífí, some of those schismatics were destroyed by the sword and some were burned. [4] The biographer gives the three following couplets (the first and second of which are Turkish, the third Persian) as examples of Temennáyí's 'blasphemous nonsense: —' [5]

[1] ای صنم سن مظهر الله سن * نسخهٔ جمله کلام الله سن

[2] The 'lean-souls' i. e. the orthodox persecutors of the Hurúfís. The meaning of the quatrain is that as the beautiful-souled, and they only, are martyred in the cause of Love, the true Lover will not shun martyrdom.

[3] در مطبخ عشق جز نکورا نکشند
لاغر صفتان زشت خورا نکشند
کر عاشق صادقی ز کشتن مگریز
مردار بود هر آنکه اورا نکشند

This Persian quatrain, attributed to Fazl-ulláh in the printed edition of Latífí, is given (more correctly) on page 8 of the printed Díwán of Nesímí under the heading: من کلام السید الجلیل الشهیر بخداوندکار 'of the words of the glorious Seyyid, he who is known as Khudávendgár, i. e. as 'The Master.' I cannot say whether this was a title of Fazl-ulláh.

[4] Latífí probably refers to the endeavour to exterminate the qalenders which Sa'd-ud-Dín says was made in 897 (1492) in consequence of the attempted assassination of Báyezíd II by one of their number.

[5] 'Alí has transferred Latífí's account of Temennáyí to his History; but

'Súfí, become a qalender, pluck out that beard and hair;
'This tittle-tattle passeth, and those are to thee a snare.' [1]

'Be no fool, nor give for something ta'en on trust the cash of life!
'Súfí, ope thine eyes, the Houris, Heaven, and Face of God are Here!' [2]

'Yonder grain of green [3] the which within his hand the gnostic holds, —
'Thousand mysteries he seeth through the vision it unfolds.' [4]

As I have failed to discover any record of later movements on the part of the Hurúfís, I am inclined to think that the activity of the sect did not extend much beyond the close of the fifteenth century. Such organisation as the body may have possessed was probably destroyed in the persecutions to which, according to Latífí, it was subjected in the reign of Báyezíd II. But that it still dragged on for quite a century and a half a more or less precarious existence is evidenced by the facts that one of the Hurúfí MSS. in Paris was transcribed in 970 (1562-3) [5] — for none save a

Hasan Chelebi and Riyází make no mention of him. I cannot answer for ᶜAshiq, as the leaf is lost from my MS. of his Tezkire on which the notice of Temennáyí would have occurred.

[1] صوفی قلندر اول کل قازت صاچی صقالی
سکا بو بر طوزاقدر کیدر بو قیل و قالی

The qalenders used often to pluck out the hair of the head and face. This 'tittle-tattle,' i. e. this trivial world. 'A snare,' the beard etc. on which men. like Fakhr-ud-Dín are wont to pride themselves. The comparison of hair to a snare (because of the threads of the latter) is common.

[2] ابله اولمه صوفی ویرمه نقد عمری نسئیه
کوزك آچ دیدار و جنت حور و غلمان بوندہ در

[3] Habbet-ul-khazrá, 'grain of green,' probably some seed with hashish-like properties which those qalenders used for its intoxicating effects.

[4] حبة الخضرا کہ بر کف عارفان جا کردہ اند
از خیال او هزاران نکتہ پیدا کردہ اند

[5] That which contains the Istiwá-Náme and the (possible) ᶜArsh-Náme (anciens Fonds Pers. 24). The MS. of the Mahabbat-Náme (Suppl. Pers., 107)

believer would endanger his life by transcribing or possessing a textbook of a proscribed sect — and that Kátib Chelebi, writing about a century later, says of the Jávidán-Náme, which he correctly calls Jávidán-i Kebír, 'this is a book in Persian prose by Fazl-ulláh the Hurúfí who wrote it concerning his doctrine; and it is well-known and circulates among the Hurúfí sect,' — from which words it is quite clear that Hurúfíism existed as a distinct form of belief in the middle of the seventeenth century. When it passed away is unrecorded; but all recollection of it seems to have disappeared from modern Turkey.

The Turks are not a fanatical people; they have never persecuted any sect merely on account of its religious opinions. The massacres that have from time to time desolated different parts of their dominions have in reality been provoked by political or social causes, not by religious animosity. If the victims have generally been members of a particular sect or community, this arises from the facts that religion and race are in the East almost convertible terms, and that the former is turned into a political tool, and used as a potent lever by the incendiary and revolutionist. Men of this class invariably play upon the religious feelings alike of the people whom they wish to incite and of those whom they seek to exasperate, — a course which in modern times has the additional advantage of enabling them to misrepresent the result of their machinations as an outburst of barbarous fanaticism. So long as a community is content to live quietly and obey the law, it may hold whatever religion it likes without molestation from the authorities. This has been the rule from the very foundation of the Ottoman Empire. If

was transcribed in 895 (1489-90). The Cambridge MS. of the Jávidán-Náme-i Kebír is undated, but Mr. Browne believes it to have been copied in the fifteenth century.

the fate of Nesímí seem to contradict this statement, it will be enough to recall the fact that the poet was put to death in a city then outside the limits of the Turkish state, and by men not of Turkish but of Arab race. It may also have been observed that the Muftí who brought about the murder of the Hurúfís at Adrianople was a Persian, not a Turk.

It is then fair to assume that there must have been something over and above their religious tenets which led to the persecutions to which the Hurúfís were undoubtedly subjected. It is not very hard to surmise what this something was; indeed it is pretty clearly suggested in some of the verses of Refí'í and Temennáyí. The leaders of the Hurúfís, like many advanced Súfís, were antinomians. When a man believes himself to be identical with God, he is hardly likely to consider himself bound by the conventional moral law; so far as concerns him, there is no difference between good and evil, all things are merged in the one fact of his own existence. Such beliefs may lead to no practical evils so long as they are confined to saints and sages; but when they are proclaimed openly to all classes of society, and when in addition the promised Paradise is declared to be here in this present world, and the houri-brides to be none other than the beauties of earth, the flood-gates of moral and social anarchy have been flung open. Here we have the real explanation of the relentless hostility shown towards the Hurúfís. Of the single-mindedness of such men as Nesímí there can be no question, but no more can there be of their utter heedlessness as to the inevitable outcome of their teaching. Dazzled, intoxicated, by what they held to be the vision of the Truth, they proclaimed from every house-top the mysteries revealed to them, neither thinking nor caring what such conduct must lead to. A creed so easy and so accomodating would at once be seized upon by the self-

indulgent and the dissolute; and we shall in all probability be guilty of little injustice if we take it that the band of sectaries who gathered round Temennáyí consisted for the most part of desperate and lawless fanatics who made religion the cloak under which to perpetrate every species of abominable outrage. Between such and the guardians of the law there could be no peace.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SCRIBE AND HIS SONS.

Saláh-ud-Dín. Yaziji-oghli Mehemmed.

While Báyezíd the Thunderbolt was winning and losing kingdoms and while his sons were rending the Turkish lands with civil war, a quiet student known as Kátib Saláh-ud-Dín or 'Saláh-ud-Dín the Scribe' was busy, most probably in the city of Angora, compiling a book the like of which had not yet been written in the Turkish tongue. This book, a full analysis of which is given by Von Hammer, was called by its author the Shemsíye or 'Solar (Poem),' and is a versified treatise on the prognostics to be drawn from meteorological phenomena such as eclipses, halos, rainbows and shooting-stars, according to the month of the solar year in which they appear. The information it contains is said to have descended from the ancient prophets and sages Noah, Daniel, [1] Plato and Loqmán. [2] The book, which is dedicated to a

[1] Daniel is looked upon as the patron and greatest master of the occult sciences. The creation of geomancy or divination by dots on sand (ʿilm-i reml) and of the science of the interpretation of dreams (ʿilm-i taʿbír) is attributed to him.

There would appear to have been two (Sir R. Burton thinks three) distinct persons who bore the name of Loqmán; but they are generally confounded in the popular mind. The first, the Loqmán mentioned in the chapter of the Koran (xxxi) called after him, was surnamed the Sage (Hakím), and

certain Qassáb ᶜAlí, or ᶜAlí the Butcher, though the author mentions Hajji Pasha (presumably the well-known physician)[1] as his patron, was finished in 811 (1408-9), and contains five thousand couplets. The style, according to Von Hammer, who has a high opinion of the value of the contents of the work, is quite without literary merit.[2]

The Ottoman historians have very little to tell us concerning this versifier or his book. Not one of the Tezkire-writers says a word about him; a brief notice in ᶜAlí, a doubtful line or two in the Crimson Peony, a short entry in Kátib Chelebi, and a few words in a later redaction of the poet's own work, are our only sources of information. ᶜAlí says that the Scribe Saláh-ud-Dín was the father of the writers Yaziji-oghli Mehemmed and Yaziji-oghli Ahmed-i Bíján, that he was well versed in the science of the stars, and compiled a great book on the prognostics deducible from terrestrial and celestial phenomena, and that he was most probably born in Angora or some other town of Rúm. This Scribe Saláh-ud-Dín of ᶜAlí is probably identical with the Sheykh Saláh-ud-Dín whom Tash-köpri-záde connects with the town of Boli and makes a friend and disciple of the great mystic Hajji Beyrám whom we have already met as the teacher of Sheykhí.[3] Kátib Chelebi enters the Scribe's book, not under his own title of Shemsíye, but under that of Mulhime, and says concerning this, that it was first ver-

is said to have been a contemporary of David and to have been related to Job. The second, also called the Sage, was an Abyssinian negro slave, and was as ugly as he was wise; he is the reputed author of a collection of fables, and is thought by many to be identical with the Æsop of the Greeks. Sir R. Burton's third Loqmán was a prince of the ancient Arab tribe of ᶜAd, and was so strong that he could dig a well with his nails.

[1] See p. 260, n. 1.

[2] I have never seen this work, of which, so far as I know, there is no copy in England.

[3] See p. 299, n. 1.

sified by Saláh-ud-Dín, and afterwards altered and improved by a poet of his (Kátib Chelebi's) own time called Jevrí. There is a MS. of Jevrí's version in the British Museum, [1] in the preface to which that poet says that in former times a maker of verses named Saláh-ud-Dín had translated this Mulhime from Persian into Turkish, but that as that version is inadequate and the language obscure, he has remodelled it at the request of a friend.

And this is all we know of Saláh-ud-Dín the Scribe.

Our information concerning the two brothers Mehemmed and Ahmed, if not quite so vague, is scarcely less meagre. We have seen that ʿÁlí makes these writers sons of Saláh-ud-Dín the Scribe; and it is not unlikely that he is correct, [2] as the patronymic Yaziji-oghli, which is given to them, certainly indicates that they were descended from someone who was emphatically known as the Scribe. [3] We are further told that they flourished during the first half of the fifteenth century, and that they studied under Hajji Beyrám at Angora.

Sheykh Mehemmed, the elder of the two, is the last notable poet of the First Period. His life seems to have been uneventful; on completing his studies at Angora, he settled at Gallipoli where he built himself a little oratory looking out upon the sea. His brother either accompanied him to Gallipoli or joined him there; and in that town the two spent their lives, dividing their time between devotional exercises and the composition of their literary works.

These few facts are all that we can glean from Latífí, Tash-köpri-záde and ʿÁlí, who alone among the earlier writers

[1] Or. 1170.

[2] Kátib Chelebi describes the elder as Mehemmed the son of Sálih.

[3] Yaziji-oghli (pronounced Yaziji-ōlu) is the Turkish; Ibn-Kátib, the Arabic form of 'the son of the Scribe.'

mention Yaziji-oghli Mehemmed. It is not easy to say why he is omitted by ʿAshiq and Hasan. These two biographers seem to have deliberately ignored most of the old religious poets; ʿAshiq Pasha is not so much as mentioned by either, while Suleymán, the author of the Birthsong, is referred to only by ʿAshiq Chelebi, and that in the most perfunctory manner.

In a brief anonymous notice of the author's life prefixed to the edition of his great poem which was lithographed in Constantinople in 1280 (1863), a few further particulars are given; but as no authority is mentioned, we are left without guarantee for their authenticity. It is there said that Mehemmed was born at Qadi-Köy, [1] that after studying under Hajji Beyrám and before settling at Gallipoli, he journeyed into Persia and Transoxiana in order to perfect his knowledge by conversing with the learned men of those lands, and that he was intimate with the Sheykhs Zeyn-ul-ʿAreb and Hayderí Kháfí. [2] So strict was the poet's asceticism, according to this writer, that during seven years of the time he passed at Gallipoli he never ate anything that had been cooked, living wholly upon fruits and such like.

The year 855 (1451) is generally given as that of Sheykh Mehemmed's death; but the writer of the notice just referred to says the poet died four years after the completion of his work, and as he himself tells us that his poem was finished in 853 (1449), this would place his death in 857 (1453). The date of Ahmed's death seems to be quite unrecorded; but it cannot have been earlier than 857 (1453), as there is extant an abridged translation of Qazwíní's ʿAjá'ib-

[1] Ismaʿíl Haqqí, in his commentary on the Muhammedíye, says that the poet was born at Malghara.

[2] This statement is borne out by a passage in Mehemmed's poem where he mentions Zeyn-ul-ʿAreb and Hayderí Kháfí as teachers of his.

ul-Makhlúqát or 'Marvels of Creation' made by him in that year. [1]

The brothers, and especially Mehemmed, whose famous poem is still popular in Turkey, enjoyed a great reputation for sanctity. Legends have grown up round Mehemmed's name. ʿAlí tells us how in his day it was believed that when the poet was engaged on his great work the mysterious prophet Khizr [2] used to come from the Unseen World and provide him with the solutions of the difficulties he encountered, a story which may perhaps account for the name Khizr u Ilyás Maqámi or the 'Place of Khizr and Ilyás,' given to the little mosque he built. [3]

The same historian further informs us that such was the fervour of the poet's love and yearning for God that once when he was writing the word 'sigh' in his book he sighed so ardently that a hole was burned in the margin of the page on which he was writing, [4] which hole ʿAlí declares he has himself seen in the autograph manuscript of Mehemmed's work. This autograph manuscript is still preserved in

[1] See the British Museum Catalogue of Turkish MSS. The ʿAjá'ib-ul-Makhlúqát is a well-known cosmographical work written in Arabic by the famous old geographer Qazwíní who died in 682 (1283-4).

[2] See p. 172, n. 1.

[3] Tash-köpri-záde says that Mehemmed himself gave this name to his mosque and quotes in evidence the following quatrain which he attributes to the poet: —

بو در اول خضر و الیاسك مقامی * دعا قیلوب ویرك بونده سلامی
بونلری بونده کوردی یازیجی اوغلی * انکیچون یاپدی بو عالی مقامی

'This is the Place of Khizr and Ilyás;
'Pray here and offer salutation.
'Yaziji-oghli saw those (i. e. Khizr and Ilyás) here,
'Therefore he built this lofty place.'

Khizr and Ilyás (Elias) are often confounded with one another and with St. George.

[4] It must be remembered that sighs are always represented by the Eastern writers as the fumes arising from a heart that is on fire with love or anguish.

the poet's mausoleum at Gallipoli, and is mentioned by the late Habíb Efendi in his interesting book on celebrated Eastern calligraphists and miniaturists. [1] According to this author, the manuscript in question, which is written in an exceptionally beautiful taʿlíq hand, [2] was at one time in some place in Constantinople which was burned down; after the conflagration the manuscript was recovered, when it was found that though the margins of the pages were singed, the text had escaped uninjured. Perhaps in this story we have a more historical explanation of the marks of burning which ʿAlí accounts for in so highly imaginative a way.

ʿAlí has yet another story which he brings forward as an instance of the piety and trust in providence which distinguished Sheykh Mehemmed. This holy man was very poor, and he and his family were often hard put to for a meal. On one such occasion his wife went out to the bath with their young children after telling her husband to watch the pot in which all the food they possessed was being cooked. While she was out, a beggar happened to pass by the house, and seeing through the open door the pot boiling, prayed the saint to give him somewhat for the love of God. Mehemmed not liking to send him empty away, gave him the pot and all it contained. When his wife returned and looked for the pot, the sheykh told her what had happened, whereupon she flew into a rage and began to revile him, saying, 'Shame on thee, thou cruel man! what are these little children to eat to-night? even suppose we be content to go without, how should they be so?' Assailed by the abuse of wife and children, Mehemmed withdrew into his oratory and there

[1] Khatt u Khattátán or 'Calligraphy and Calligraphists,' published by Ebu-z-Ziyá Tevfíq Bey in 1306 (1888-9).

[2] The taʿlíq is a beautiful variety of handwriting formerly much used for copying books of poetry.

prayed God to provide his family with food. While he was still praying, some one knocked at the door of the house, and when his wife came to tell him of this, he said, 'What is come is the gracious provision of God which thou desirest and which thou hast made me shame myself by asking.' And indeed when they went out they saw that a messenger from the cadi was there bringing them ten different sorts of delicate foods. For it had so happened that that night a pursuivant from the Sultan had come with some message to the cadi of the town, which pursuivant being a pious man and having heard of the fame of Sheykh Mehemmed, had asked the cadi concerning him. But the cadi, who was a worldling, had spoken slightingly of the holy man, saying to his guest, 'Heaven forefend thou should praise hypocrites such as he!' Whereupon the pursuivant, being vexed, had declared that he would eat nothing of the delicacies provided for him unless the sheykh partook of them likewise. So the cadi, knowing it would be useless to invite Mehemmed to his house, had sent him a portion of all that was prepared. And thus, adds ᶜAlí, was exemplified what is said in the Koran, 'Whoso bringeth a good work shall receive ten like unto it.' [1]

With regard to the younger brother Ahmed, the Crimson Peony tells us that he owed his surname of Bíján or 'the Lifeless' to the fact that the fire of asceticism had so wasted his frame that he became frail and fragile as one who is scarce living. [2]

[1] Koran, vi, 161.

[2] ᶜAlí mentions a report that Ahmed had spent his youth in dissipation; but one day, having realised the wickedness of the life he was leading, he had gone to his brother and told him of his repentance, and had expressed his regret that while he (his brother) had composed so many books that would ensure for him the blessings of posterity, he himself had nothing to show; whereupon Mehemmed wrote the Enwár-ul-ᶜAshiqín in his brother's name. It

The most important literary works of the two brothers are an Arabic religious treatise entitled Maghárib-uz-Zemán or 'The Setting-points [1] of Time,' by Mehemmed; a Turkish prose translation of the same, which is called Enwár-ul-ᶜÁshiqín or 'Lights for Lovers,' by Ahmed; and a Turkish metrical version, known as the Muhammedíye, by Mehemmed himself.

The history of how these three books came to be written is told by Ahmed both at the beginning and end of the Enwár-ul-ᶜÁshiqín in almost identical words. [2] He says: 'I had a brother, Mehemmed by name, who was a man of learning, a gnostic, perfect and excellent, the friend of God, and the chief of the attainers, [3] and who was moreover the familiar of the Pole of the World Hajji Beyrám, and the sterling coin of the saints, and the perfect heir of the Prophet [4] — may God Most High keep him safe in the here and the Hereafter, and apportion him and his in the Paradise of Eden! And I, poor Ahmed the Lifeless, did ever say to him, 'O brother, the world hath no permanency and fortune no constancy; let it be that thou draw up a remem-

is impossible to accept this story in face of the positive statements of both Mehemmed and Ahmed concerning the composition of the book in question.

[1] Maghárib is the plural of Maghrib which means the setting place or time of a heavenly body.

[2] The Enwár-ul-ᶜAshiqín has been printed several times: in Constantinople in 1261 (1485), in Kazan in 1861, and twice at Búláq, the second edition being dated 1300 (1882-3); it was also lithographed in Constantinople in 1291 (1874-5).

[3] i. e. those who attain to God, who pierce through phenomena and reach the Goal.

[4] This expression is probably an echo of the Hadís اَلْعُلَمَاءُ وَرَثَةُ الْاَنْبِيَاءِ 'The learned are the heirs of the Prophets.' In another similar Hadís the Prophet says, عُلَمَاءُ اُمَّتِى كَاَنْبِيَاءِ بَنِى اِسْرَائِيلَ 'The learned of my people are as the Prophets of the children of Israel.'

brance that shall be read in the world.' And he, in compliance with my words, drew up the book named Maghárib-uz-Zemán; and whatsoever there be in the world of Koranic commentaries and elucidations and ensamples, alike exoteric and esoteric, he culled from many books and from the mouths of many perfect gnostics and learned traditionists; and from the books of the Sheykhs (mystics) comments on the Koran and on the Traditions Divine and Apostolic.[1] In short, he gathered the pith of the twelve sciences into one place. Thereafter he said to me, 'Ahmed the Lifeless, lo, in compliance with thy word, have I gathered the subtleties, the laws, the verities of existing things together into one place; now come thou and turn this book, the which is the Maghárib-uz-Zemán, into the Turkish tongue, that these our countrymen likewise may gain advantage from learning and from the light of knowledge.' So in compliance with his blessed words, poor I completed this book, which I have named Enwár-ul-ᶜAshiqín, 'Lights for Lovers,' in the fairest of towns, the seat of the holy war,[2] Gallipoli. Now this my Enwár-ul-ᶜAshiqín and my brother's poem the Muhammedíye both have issued forth from the Maghárib. That book (the Muhammedíye) is in verse, this book (the Enwár) is in prose. Thus it hath so fallen that they[3] have written this matter after two fashions; on the one hand they have versified it that it may be sweet, on the other they have written it in prose that it may be easy to be under-

[1] As we have seen more than once, a Tradition (Hadís) is said to be Divine when God is the speaker, to be Apostolic or Blessed when the Prophet is.

[2] As Constantinople was still in the hands of the enemy, Gallipoli was at this time one of the outposts of Islam; so Ahmed calls it dár-ul-jihád or 'the seat of the holy war.' ᶜAlí says that it was because Gallipoli was thus an outpost of the Champions of the Faith that Mehemmed chose it for his home.

[3] Nowadays an author would write 'we have written' for Ahmed's 'they have written.'

stood. And both fashions are good, and esteemed of those who are worthy of them. Thou wouldst deem the Encircling Ocean [1] had risen and overflowed on either side and had exposed whatsoever of pearls there be. If thou seek the 'hidden pearl,' [2] read the Enwár-ul-ᶜAshiqín; if thou seek 'the hire ungrudged,' [2] read the Muhammedíye. Praise be to God that we two brethren have compiled these two books; and we have borne these many toils upon this road that the folk may say, Mercy be upon the sons of the Scribe!'

From this statement, which, as has been said, occurs twice in almost identical terms in the Enwár, and which, as we shall see, is also found in substance in the epilogue to the Muhammedíye, we gather that the Maghárib, which Mehemmed compiled at his brother's suggestion, and which forms the source of the two Turkish books, is a collection of commentaries and other explanations, exoteric and esoteric, on certain Koranic verses and Traditions Divine and Apostolic. And such is in fact the substance of the Muhammedíye and the Enwár-ul-ᶜAshiqín.

To confine our attention to the former [3] which alone directly

[1] See p. 38. Here the Encircling Ocean is intended to suggest the Maghárib.

[2] The two expressions, durr-i meknún 'hidden pearls' and ejr-i ghayr-i memnún 'hire ungrudged,' are Koranic. The first is used in lii, 24, where speaking of the youths of Paradise, it is said, 'And round them shall go boys of theirs, as though they were hidden pearls;' and again in lvi, 22, where speaking of the houris, it is said, 'And bright and large-eyed maids like hidden pearls.' But in both these passages the word used for 'pearl' is lu²lu², while that employed by Ahmed is durr. The second expression occurs three times, in xli, 7; lxxxiv, 25; and xcv, 6, where speaking of 'those who believe and act aright,' it is said that 'for them is a hire ungrudged.'

[3] The Muhammedíye was edited by Kázim Beg and printed at Qazan in 1848. It has been three times lithographed in Constantinople, in 1258 (1842-3), 1270 (1853-4) and 1280 (1863-4). The 1258 edition of Haqqí's commentary thereon contains the complete text of the poem. There is a complete MS. of the poem in the British Museum (Or. 1040), also an imperfect copy (Add. 6536).

concerns us, we find that this poem consists of a series of explanations by different authorities on certain passages in the Koran and the Traditions that refer to certain subjects. In plan the book falls into three great divisions which deal respectively with the Creation, the Mission of Muhammed, and the End of the World. The scriptural texts concerning these subjects are arranged according to the order of the events, each being followed by the Turkish metrical paraphrase of the expositions offered by the several commentators and traditionists. The subjects themselves are treated in considerable detail. Thus in the first division, that dealing with the creation of the universe, the poet commences by giving the mystic-philosophic account of the beginning of all things by the passage of phenomena from potential to actual existence; after which he takes up the legend of the Light of Muhammed, and tells how all subsequent beings were created therefrom. Then we get the traditions as to the creation of the ʿArsh and the Kursí, the Eight Paradises, the Seven Heavens, the Seven Earths, the Seven Hells, and so on;[1] after which comes the story of Adam and Eve, in whose appearance creation culminates. A rapid enumeration of the Prophets who succeeded Adam and kept alive the Faith brings us to the second division of the poem, that which treats of the life and work of Muhammed. Here, as in Suleymán's Birthsong, the historical and the legendary elements in the story are blended together and presented to the reader as of equal value. The section is extended to cover a short account of the first four Khalífas and the Prophet's grandsons Hasan and Huseyn. The last section, which has for subject the end of the world, opens with a description of the signs, such as the appearance of Antichrist, and the irruption of Gog and Magog, that are to

[1] As described on pp. 34-9.

herald that event; after which it gives a detailed account of the order of procedure which will be observed at the Last Judgment, and finishes with a description of the life of the blessed in Paradise. The section is followed by a few mystic cantos, after which comes the epilogue.

In the canto 'Touching the Reason of the Writing of the Book,' which, as usual, occurs at the beginning of this poem, Yaziji-oghli Mehemmed tells how one day when he was seated in his cell at Gallipoli engaged in devout meditation, the 'Lovers' of the town came into his presence and asked him why he did not publish to the world the glories of the Prophet, to which he replied that there were already many books thereon. His friends then proposed that he should write a work dealing with the commentaries, and this he consented to do, so God should help him.[1] One night he saw in a vision Muhammed seated, the centre of a radiant circle formed of his Companions. But all of them were veiled so that their faces were invisible, and before them were set china cups filled with water. The poet asked someone who was there what this meant, and was answered in these words, 'For whom should their veils be withdrawn? and who they who should be distraught by their beauty? or to whom should their wine be given? who they who should be the inebriates of this feast?' When the poet heard this he wept bitterly and rent his garments; for 'how could any heart bear this estrangement? could even the hard flint endure such woe?' But when the Prophet saw his anguish, he laid the balm upon his wound, saying, 'Raise the veil from before thine own heart and seek the radiance of my beauty in thine own soul.' The Apostle then bade him give his people the wine of wisdom to drink, and publish his words abroad to all the folk, so that all nations may know the wonders

[1] Perhaps this is a poetical version of Ahmed's suggestion.

he has wrought and that his words may reach to every land. When the poet thus received the Apostolic command, he besought God to aid him and set to work, and the result is the Muhammedíye.

In the epilogue, the author, after thanking God for having enabled him to complete his work, goes on to say that three times during the course of its composition the Prophet had appeared to him in his dreams. The first occasion is that already described in the prologue; on the second the Prophet had addressed to him some words of encouragement, bidding him be of good cheer. On the third he had beheld the Apostle surrounded by a circle of saintly mystics; and this time, when the poet, who had his book in his hand, had knelt down, the Prophet had looked upon him and promised to teach him. On another occasion, when he was offering thanks to God and praying for the success of his book, his old master Hajji Beyrám appeared before him and promised him God's aid and acceptance of this book in which he has written all that is and all that will be. The saint went on to compliment him on the style of his poem, and assured him that the book would become famous and would remain unrivalled, and that its perusal would bring blessings to its readers. The poet offered his thanks to the saint, through whose spiritual influence, he says, he has won success. Some of the poet's friends then entered the room, and told him that as his book is unique, he should present it to the King of Persia, or to the Sultan of Egypt, or to the Sultan of Rúm, namely, Murád the son of Mehemmed. [1] This opens the way for a prayer for the welfare of Sultan Murád and of his son Mehemmed who is now seated on the throne. The poet then proceeds to eulogize the Vezir Mahmúd Pasha bin-Qassáb

[1] The Muhammedíye is not dedicated to any patron.

(i. e. Mahmúd Pasha the son of the Butcher), [1] who, he says, had been very kind to him, and under whose protection he had settled at Gallipoli.

Mehemmed then proceeds to tell the story of his own and his brother's works in almost the very words twice used by Ahmed in the Enwár-ul-ʿAshiqín. Mehemmed says, 'I had [2] a brother, named the Lifeless, who used to encourage me, saying, 'O my Soul, thou knowest how fortune hath no constancy; leave that which shall be a remembrance after thee.' In compliance with these words, O beloved, I made the book named Maghárib (the like of) which none had seen; I found whatsoever there be in the world of Koranic commentaries, and of each of these I took the pith. * * * * In the Maghárib I wrote of the beginning and of the end of the world. I said to the Lifeless, 'Come, now, as I have drawn up this book, do thou turn it into the Turkish tongue that it be spread abroad in country and in town.' In compliance with these words, he completed it (i. e. the translation); he finished it at Gallipoli. Likewise this (present) book of mine hath been drawn up, and set in order like (a string of) pearls. So both of these (i. e. the Enwár and the Muhammedíye) have come forth from the Maghárib. The Sea hath risen and overflowed on either side. If the former be (regarded), it is the 'hidden pearl;' if the latter be, it is 'the hire ungrudged.' Praise be to God that we two brethren have published abroad these two books. We have borne toil upon

[1] Possibly this Qassáb or Butcher, the father of Mahmúd Pasha, is the Qassáb ʿAlí or ʿAlí the Butcher to whom, according to Von Hammer, the Shemsíye is dedicated.

[2] It is curious that Mehemmed and Ahmed speak, each of the other, in the past tense, 'I had a brother,' as though the brother in question were dead. But such was not the case; Ahmed in the same sentence prays that Mehemmed may be kept safe in the here and the Hereafter, which shows that the latter was still alive; while we know that Ahmed himself lived for some years after 853, the date of the completion of the Muhammedíye.

this road for this that they may say: Mercy be upon the sons of the Scribe!'

We are then told that the book was finished in the Latter Jemádí of 853 (July-Aug. 1449).[1] After which the poet relates how on its completion he was summoned in the spirit into the presence of the Prophet to whom he offered his book and whose blessing he implored for Gallipoli, its people and magistrates, and for himself, his parents and his brothers, and for his teachers Zeyn-ul-ʿAreb and Hayderí Kháfí. In the third couplet from the end he says that he has called his book Er-Risálet-ul-Muhammedíye or 'The Muhammedan Treatise.'

The author does not say why he gave this title to his poem, but Tash-köpri-záde is probably right in saying that he so named it because it deals chiefly with matters connected with the Prophet, and was written at his command. Certainly the poet has contrived to make his work into what is practically a long panegyric on the Apostle by his insistence on the tradition that the creation of the world was brought about because of the Creator's love for the Light of Muhammed and was accomplished through the medium of that Light.[2] The full title, Er-Risálet-ul-Muhammedíye, is hardly ever used; the book is almost always called simply 'the Muhammedíye.'

The form of the Muhammedíye is very peculiar, the poem being written in a series of sections in alternate monorhyme and mesneví. At first the monorhyming sections are arranged in regular alphabetical order, exactly as the ghazels in a díwán; but when the whole alphabet has been gone through

[1] Mehemmed here says distinctly that his Muhammedíye was finished in 853; he has just spoken of his brother's Enwár as 'completed;' but Ahmed himself says that he finished his book in 855. How are we to explain the discrepancy?

[2] See pp. 34-5.

once, the strictness of this rule is relaxed, and only an approximation to alphabetical order is observed. The sections are interrupted at irregular intervals by a couplet introduced by way of refrain. This couplet is repeated about half a dozen times and is then replaced by another. In prosody the poem shows yet greater diversity; several metres are employed, the author himself says that he has made use of seven varieties.

The changes from monorhyme to mesneví and *vice versa* seem to be quite arbitrary; no principle or method is apparent; it looks as though the writer had, when he got tired of the one, passed into the other, heedless of all considerations outside his own fancy. He does not wait till he has finished a subject, or even a particular exposition of a subject, to make this change, but jumps from the one form to the other in the middle of a paragraph, sometimes almost in the middle of a sentence.

Of the poetic value of the Muhammedíye it is not possible to speak very highly. The subjects of the book — the legends concerning the beginning and the end of all things, and the mission of the Prophet — might in the hands of a great poet, a Dante or a Milton, have been moulded into some splendid epic; but not even a great poet could have fashioned from them a work of art, keeping to the lines laid down by Mehemmed. Artistry and poetry alike are outside the question when a writer sits down to paraphrase one after another all the commentaries he can find on a series of texts. But to do Mehemmed justice, his aim was neither artistry nor poetry, but simply to convey instruction in a pleasant way; 'they have versified it that it may be sweet,' says Ahmed. And that this aim has been abundantly realised is shown by the great popularity which his work has always enjoyed and still enjoys, especially among the

less highly educated, and more particularly with old ladies. [1] Mehemmed is as a rule quite simple in his language, except in the case of the rhyme-words in the monorhyming sections, which are often very unusual Arabic terms. So difficult are many of these that in a great number of cases it has been thought necessary to explain their meaning on the margins in the popular lithographed editions.

Latífí bears witness to the esteem in which the Muhammedíye was held in his time when he says that it is much appreciated by teachers of the commentaries and traditions on account of its accuracy and lucidity. The biographer himself had a high opinion of the work, the study of which, he declares, is fraught with advantage for the faithful. He specially praises a qasída which he says contains many veiled allusions to the Súfí mysteries. [2]

[1] Elderly ladies of a devout turn of mind often hold meetings for the reading of the Muhammedíye. On such occasions they assemble at the house of one of the wealthier of their number. After performing an ablution, each wraps a white cloth over her head (as women always do when saying the canonical prayers); a prayer or two is then repeated, and when these are over, and all present have seated themselves, the most learned among them opens the Muhammedíye and intones therefrom a passage of greater or less length. This performance is repeated time after time till the whole poem has been gone through, when it may be recommenced if the party is so minded. That these pious souls do not always understand everything they read or hear, in no way detracts from their satisfaction.

[2] This qasída opens with the lines: —

الا ای سرور خوبان من الاین الی الاین

دمادم کشف دیدار ایت کتور یوزدن حجابین

'O Leader of the lovely ones, from Whence to Whither dost Thou go?

'Upraise the twyfold veil therefrom, and whiles Thy beauteous Visage show!'

The 'twyfold veil' of the second line probably refers to the hijáb-i núrání or 'veil of radiance,' and the hijáb-i zulmání or 'veil of darkness,' spoken of by the mystics, terms which may be taken to mean respectively good and evil as manifested in phenomena, for all phenomena are veils interposed between the human soul and the One.

A commentary on the Muhammedíye, entitled Ferah-ur-Rúh or 'The Joy of the Soul,' was written by Ismaʿíl Haqqí who also commented on the Koran, the Mesneví and other famous works, and who died in 1137 (1724-5).

It is said that a Persian translation of the poem was made by the contemporary Persian writer who is best known under his surname of Musannifek or 'the Little Author.' [1]

Tash-köpri-záde and ʿAlí tell us that Sheykh Mehemmed is the author of a commentary on Muhí-ud-Dín bin-ʿArebí's famous work the Fusús-ul-Hikem or 'Gems of Philosophy.' [2] But of this production the former critic does not speak very favourably, as he says that the sheykh passes over the real difficulties in the work he is professing to elucidate. A commentary on the Fátiha is mentioned in a note to the Crimson Peony; which commentary, it is there said, is directed specially against the heretical sect called Vujúdíye.

Ahmed-i Bíján is credited with two cosmographical works named respectively Durr-i Meknún or 'The Hidden Pearl' and ʿAjáʾib-ul-Makhlúqát or 'The Marvels of Creation;' the latter, as already said, is merely an abridged translation of Qazwíní's well-known work of the same name, and was finished about the time of the capture of Constantinople, i. e. 857 (1453).

In the following passage, [3] which occurs at the beginning of the Muhammedíye, the author has versified the mystic-philosophic account of the origins; his subject is the passing of what are usually called the Essences (Máhiyát), but by

[1] This surname was given to the celebrated scholar ʿAlá-ud-Dín ʿAlí on account of his having begun his literary career at a very tender age. He was born in Persia in 803 (1400-1), and settled in Turkey in 848 (1444-5), where he died in 875 (1470-1).

[2] See p. 60, n. 2.

[3] This passage, it may be remarked, is unrepresented in the Enwár-ul-ʿAshiqín.

him are called the Verities (Haqá'iq),[1] from Potential to Actual existence.

According to the theory here followed, the Essences of all things are the result of the working of the Divine Faculties, here called Names. But the existence of these Essences, or Verities as the poet prefers to call them, is in two degrees, firstly Potentiality (Subút), secondly Actuality (Vujúd). When the Essence passes from the former into the latter, it is said to be actualised (mevjúd). The absence or presence of the ásár, that is 'works' or 'properties,' is held to determine whether existence be 'potential' or 'actual.' Thus the fire in an unstruck match is in 'potential existence,' as the 'properties' of fire, i. e. light, heat, etc. are absent; but when the same match is struck, the fire has sprung into 'actual existence,' as is evidenced by the presence of heat, light and the other 'properties' of fire. In this poem the Essences or Verities are represented as still in Potentiality and as craving to be passed into Actuality.

From the Risále-i Muhammedíye. [66]

The Kingdom His! the Praise, the Thanks! for His the Generosity!
Creation His! and His Command! Aid His! and Liberality![2]
All self-sufficing was The Truth; His Being the sheer Absolute;
The Names, they were the Attributes, merged yet in His Ipseity.[3]

[1] They are what some would call the Fixed Prototypes (p. 55), what others would describe as the Word (i. e. Thought) of God.

[2] This couplet, which in the original is in Arabic, is merely interjectional, having no direct connection with what follows.

[3] The poet here declares that the Divine Names and the Divine Attributes are identical, and merged in the Divine Ipseity (see the passage from Sheykh 'Abdulláh translated on pp. 60-1). By the Divine Attributes are meant qualities inherent in the Divine Nature, such as Love, Power, Wisdom and Justice (see p. 61). In the first of the following couplets from an Arabic poem we have the opinion of the Mutekellimín or Scholastics on the nature of these, and in the second we have that of the Súfís: —

His Name is thus His Self; epiphany His Actual Being is;[1]
Yet He is higher than the twain: know thou this glorious subtlety.[2]
The Attributes were things desirable, the Names degrees therein,[3]
The Verities resulted thence;[4] and all of these cried prayerfully: —[5]
'How long, how long, do we remain here in the stores of the Inane!
'Hid in the Unity's domain, in nothingness, in cecity!
'Yea, truly high-enthroned are we! what lords of lofty might we be!
'But yet the Most Hid Secret we; our need, it is epiphany!
''Tis ye who are our prop and stay; 'tis ye who are our kings to-day;
''Tis ye who are our inward ray. Vouchsafe to us existency!
'If we be manifested, ye shall likewise manifested be;
'And shown will be the glorious Law, and known the bright Sagacity.'[6]
Soon as the Names heard this they flocked together, to one place they came,
And cried, 'O Lord! reveal us now without or stint or secrecy!'
So firstly all the Names besought the Name Creator to this end;
It said, 'The Name the Able seek, to fashion is its property.'

صِفَاتُ ٱللّٰهِ لَيْسَتْ عَيْنَ ذَاتٍ * وَ لَا غَيْرًا سَوَاهُ ذَا ٱنْفِصَالِ
وَ لَيْسَ ٱلْاِسْمُ غَيْرًا لِلْمُسَمَّى * لَدَى أَهْلِ ٱلْبَصِيرَةِ خَيْرِ آلِ

'The Attributes of God are not identical with His Self,
'Neither are they other than He that they should be separable from Him.
'The Name is not other than the Named
'With them of Insight, noble of lineage.'

[1] Epiphany (tejellí), that is, the Divine self-manifestation through phenomena, is here said to be the Actualised Existence (Vujúd) of God.

[2] He Himself is higher than His Self and higher than His Actualised Existence, in that He embraces both.

[3] The Attributes were thus desirable, i. e. good, noble things (qualities); and the Names are now defined as 'degrees' therein, a definition the reason of which will appear a little farther on.

[4] Here the poet tells us that the Verities (i. e. the Essences) result from the (nature of the) Names, which themselves mark degrees or stages in the series of the Attributes, which in their turn were merged in the Divine Ipseity.

[5] The next four couplets are the prayer of the Verities, still in Potentiality, to be clothed with Actuality. They complain of the length of time they have remained in Potentiality, unrealised, and although lying in the very bosom of God, they cry for manifestation, that is for Actualised Existence. The prayer is addressed immediately to the Names.

[6] i. e. the Law and the Wisdom of God.

The Name the Able said, 'Revealment with the Name the Willer lies;
'The actual is at its command; to show, in its authority.'
Then cried they to the Name the Willer, 'Do thou manifest us now!'
It made reply, ''Tis by the Name the Knower must be signed this plea.'[1]
The Name the Knower said, 'Your revelation is well-understood;
'But learn ye that the Name the Self compriseth all the Names that be.'[2]
Then all the Names together flocked, and to the Name the Self they said,
'Orders upon thy order rest; things are in thy authority.'
Then said the Name the Self, 'I am indeed that Most Great Name,[3] so I
'Do point unto the Naméd who is God who doth as willeth He.
'Exempt His Self from aught of contradiction and from aught of flaw!
'Aloof His Nature that thereto should e'er reach perspicacity!
(O King Most Great to whose Perfection declination ne'er may win!
To whose fair Beauty for whose Glore imagination ne'er may win!)[4]
'Do ye without His Glory's veil abide while I before Him go
'And see how He will order since ye cry with importunity.'
It went before the Very Self, and said, 'My Lord! and O my Lord!
'As Thou the Knower art of secrets, there is naught concealed from Thee.'.

[1] The several Names (Knower = ᶜAlim: Willer = Murid: Able = Qádir: Creator = Bárí), each that of a Divine Attribute, mentioned in these couplets indicate the series of faculties necessary for the making or creation of anything. If we would make or create anything, we must first have the Knowledge how to do so; but the Knowledge alone is not enough, we must also have the Will; but Knowledge and Will are insufficient without Ability; then, when we have these three, we begin our work of Creation. These steps, Knowledge, Will, Ability, indicate what the poet means in the fourth couplet when he speaks of the Names being 'degrees' in the series of the Attributes.

This passage further teaches us that what is last in result is first in intention The intention which started the activity among the Names was Creation, the result in which it ended was Creation.

[2] The Name of Self (Ism-i Zát) is simply Alláh i. e. God; but as God comprises in Himself all His Attributes, so does the Name of God comprise in itself all the Names of His Attributes. The word Alláh is thus defined: وَاجِبُ ٱلْوُجُودِ ٱلْمُسْتَجْمِعُ لِجَمِيعِ صِفَاتِ ٱلْكَمَالِ 'the necessarily Existent who compriseth the totality of the Attributes of Perfection.'

[3] For the expression 'the Most Great Name' see p. 379, n. 2.

[4] This couplet again is simply interjectional; it occurs several times, by way of a burden or refrain, in the earlier pages of the Muhammediye. It forms no part of the Name Self's speech.

The Self replied, 'I am that Self the independent of degrees:
'From Actual and Manifest nor hurt nor profit is to Me.
'But since the Verities implore and earnest pray of all the Names,
'And since Our Names desire that thou should grant this thing they crave of thee,
'Go now, command the Names, and let these straightway the command obey,
'Thus let the Verities come forth in untold multiplicity.
'Let every Name bestow on every Verity that seeks therefor
'Such virtue as its strength may bear: Wrought through all worlds be this decree!'[1]

What time the Prototypes[2] to come to realised existence sought
They cried, 'We fear lest there should overtake us dire calamity!'
So then the Name the Schemer came, and said, 'First, Name Sustainer! list![3]
'Let the Contingents' order stand; that naught destroy it do thou see!'
When heard of this the Name of Self, it made two Names vezirs, and these,
The Schemer and the Executor which achieves all things that be.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

The author here passes off into the legend of the Light of Muhammed, and tells how this was the first thing created and became the medium through which all subsequent beings came into existence.

[1] The Divine order is that every Name shall bestow on every Verity that desires it, such Divine grace as that Verity is capable of receiving; and that the Names shall carry out this command through all the (Five) Worlds (see pp. 54-6) which, already potentially existent, are on the verge of being actualised.

[2] Here the author uses for the first time the term Aʿyán 'Prototypes' to describe what he has hitherto called the Verities.

[3] On passing from the Potential to the Actual, the Verities, now Actualities, have become in the fullest sense contingent beings; their nature therefore lies between true existence and non-existence. To save them from the latter, some additional strength must be given to the former; so the Name Sustainer (Ism-i Rabb) is first summoned, and the contingent creation made over to its charge.

CHAPTER IX.

Minor Poets of the First Period.

Lyric Poets. Mevlevís. Romancists.

We have now made the acquaintance of all the more noteworthy among the West-Turkish poets who flourished between the years 1300 and 1450. But the list of pioneers is still far from complete. The names of several others who in this First Period essayed to speak in verse are recorded by the biographers; while others again, concerning whom these writers are silent, bear witness to their own life and labours in the works they have bequeathed to us.

Of the former class, those mentioned by the biographers, are the lyric writers Sheykh Mahmúd, Kemál-i Khalvetí, Kemál-i Ummí, Ezherí, Khákí and ʿAtáʾí.

The first of these, Sheykh Mahmúd, is mentioned only by ʿÁlí, who says that he was an ancestor of Suleymán Chelebi the author of the Birthsong, and that on the successful passage of the Dardanelles by Sultan Orkhan's son Suleymán Pasha, an expedition which laid the foundation of the Ottoman power in Europe, he presented that Prince with a congratulatory address in which occurs the couplet: —

Thy saintship unto all thou'st shown, thy prayer-rug launching on the sea;[1]
Rumelia's collar[2] hast thou seizéd with the hand of piety.[3]

All the others appear for the first time in Latífí, whose brief notices concerning them are reproduced, with scarcely more than a few verbal alterations, now by one, now by another of his successors. All these obscure versifiers wrote during the first half of the fifteenth century, that is, at the beginning of the period of literary activity which followed the Tartar invasion.

Of Kemál-i Khalvetí we are told only that he was a disciple of Hajji Beyrám,[4] and that he wrote Súfíistic verses, as an example of which Latífí quotes this couplet: —

Ne'er may he who is not foeman of the flesh be friend of God;
Dwells the Paradisal Glory midst the Pride of Earth's Abode?[5]

[1] It is told of several of the saints of old that when they wished to cross a river they used to spread their prayer-rug on the surface of the water, seat themselves thereupon, and be miraculously carried over to the other side. The allusion in the verse is to the raft on which the Prince and his companions crossed the strait at dead of night.

[2] i. e. the shore of Rumelia.

[3] ولایت کوسترروب خلقه صویه سجّاده صالمش سن
یقاسن روم ایلینك دسنت تقوا ایله المش سن

[4] In my MS. of Latífí it is further said that this poet lived in a cell in 'the tower of Germiyan' (Germiyan qulesi).

[5] دوست اولمز نفسه دشمن اولمیان مولا ایله
عزّ دنیا جمع اولامسی دولست عقبا ایله

This verse is replaced in my MS. of the Tezkire by two others of which the following is one: —

عاریت در هر ملیحك حسنی حسنندن انك
بلکه حسنی هر ملیحك اندن اولمشدر ملیح

'But a loan is every sweet one's beauty from His Beauty sheen;
'Nay, through Him it is that every sweet one's beauty sweet doth show.'

Concerning Kemál-i Ummí, who was a dervish of Larende in Qaraman, Latífí tells the following story which he says he heard among the dervishes. Once Kemál-i Ummí and the great poet Nesímí were lodging as guests in the tekye (dervish-convent) of the then famous mystic saint Sultán Shujá', [1] when unknown to and without the permission of that holy man, they caught a stray ram belonging to him. This they slaughtered and were preparing to cook when the Sheykh discovered them, and, annoyed at the liberty they had taken, he laid a razor before Nesímí and a rope-girdle before Ummí, thus indicating to each what manner of death he should die. Nesímí was, as we know, flayed for blasphemy, and it is said that Ummí was hanged for a similar offence. The verses of the latter were of a contemplative character, dealing chiefly, according to 'Alí, with the transitoriness of wordly things. These lines are given by Latífí and reproduced by 'Alí: —

Verses. [67]

How many a Khan [2] within this khan [2] hath lighted!
How many a King on this divan hath lighted!
An ancient caravanseray the world is
Where many and many a caravan hath lighted.

'Alí gives another couplet: —

کل ای عارف کوکل ویرمه فنا دنیای غدّاره
اکر شهباز وحدتسك چو کرکس قونمه مرداره

'O gnostic, come, nor on this false and fleeting world thy heart bestow;
'Nor vulture-like, on carrion light, an so the hawk of One-ness thou.'

[1] This Sultán Shujá' is probably Sheykh Shujá'-ud-Dín of Qaraman who flourished during the reigns of Mehemmed I and Murád II, and whose life is given in the Crimson Peony.

[2] The word Khan has two meanings: 'a Tartar sovereign' and 'an inn.' As the former, in Turkey it is a title of the Sultan; in Persia it is given to many among the upper classes.

A guest within the world's alberge art thou now
Where many a traveller pale and wan hath lighted.
A-weeping came they all, a-weeping went they;
Say, who of these a joyous man hath lighted?
Not one hath found a theriac for death's banc,
Yet here full many a sage Loqmán [1] hath lighted.

Ezherí of Aq-Shehir was a contemporary of Ahmedí and Sheykhí. His personal name was Núr-ud-Dín (Light of the Faith) whence, according to Latífí, he took his makhlas of Ezherí, which means 'He of the Most Brilliant.' ʿÁlí says that he was also known as Bághbán-záde or 'Gardener's son,' from which designation Von Hammer is inclined to derive the makhlas. [2] Latífí while admitting that the verses of this writer are brilliant and artistic in expression, pronounces them to be common-place in conception, and adds that the poet held but a mediocre rank among his contemporaries. The biographer quotes these couplets which describe how Fortune favours the worthless: —

Silver by handfuls doth the fool obtain;
The wise man hath not in his hand a grain. [3]

Wrapt in rush-mat, see the sugar-cane a-tremble in the field;
Look then how upon the onion's back there lieth coat on coat. [4]

[1] For Loqmán the sage, see p. 389, n. 2.

[2] Von Hammer's derivation is probably erroneous, although the word ezherí appears to occur occasionally in Arabic in the sense of 'florist.' See Dozy's 'Supplément aux Dictionnaires Arabes.'

[3] مذلّه سیمی مرد نادانك * دانه‌سی بوق النده دانانك

[4] بوریایه صاریلوب صحراده دتر نیشکر
کل پیازی کورکه قات قات ارقه‌سنده جامه‌سی

ʿÁlí criticises the second line of this couplet, saying that had the poet written:

کل پیازی کور که قات قات جامهٔ رنکین کیر

'Look then how the onion weareth sheeny raiment coat on coat,'

Khákí was one of those West-Turkish poets who lived and wrote outside the limits of the Ottoman dominions. He was a citizen of Qastamuni in the days when that town was the capital of an independent state, and there he resided during the reign of Isma'íl Bey, a ruler the date of whose accession seems to be unrecorded, but who was deposed in favour of his brother by the Ottoman Sultan, Mehemmed II, in 863 (1458-9).[1] Khákí's verses, which were mostly mystical, are said to have enjoyed considerable reputation in his own time; but after the annexation of Qastamuni, other and more brilliant poets arose there, and the works of this old writer fell into oblivion. Latífí quotes a few of his verses, of which the following is the best: —

Flout me not, although ye see my garment rent, O comrades mine!
I too once was of the holy ones, but Love hath wrought my shame![2]

'Atá'í is said by Latífí to have been born in Adrianople and to have been the son of a Vezir named 'Iwaz Pasha who distinguished himself by beating back an assault which the Qaraman Turks made upon Brusa while the Ottoman civil war was in progress. Latífí's further statement that 'Atá'í was a younger brother of Suleymán Chelebi the author of the Birthsong is not, as 'Alí implies, necessarily erroneous, but as we are distinctly told that 'Atá'í was but a youth in the time of Murád II, it is most probable that there is here some confusion. 'Atá'í, it appears, was as remarkable

the verse would at once have had more point and been more correct in expression. The sugar-cane of course typifies the sweet-souled; the onion, the coarse or vulgar-natured.

[1] Isma'íl Bey was the seventh of the eight rulers who form the dynasty called sometimes Qizil-Ahmedli, sometimes Isfendyárli.

[2] دوستلر چاك كريبانم كوروب عيب اينمه كوز
بن دخى بر پارسايدم كه رسوا قلدى عشق

for his personal grace and beauty as for his talents and accomplishments; and on the death of his father, Sultan Murád desired to enrol him among his boon-companions. But the young man dreaded the dangerous honour, and excused himself in a poem which he presented to the sovereign.[1] According to ʿAshiq, this poet died while still in his youth. ʿAtá'í's verses, though now long forgotten, must have been thought well of in the fifteenth century; for we read that two of the most notable of the poets who succeeded him, namely, Ahmed Pasha and Nejátí, were not above taking hints from his Díwán. The biographers give one or two instances of this. Among the couplets quoted by ʿAlí as illustrative of ʿAtá'í's style is the following: —

Her tresses do the hyacinth with but one hair enthral;
Her teeth with but one grain the pearl of lustre fair enthral.[2]

[1] ʿAshiq and Hasan say that it was Mehemmed II, not Murád II, who made this proposal to ʿAtá'í; but the dates suit better with the statement of Latífí and ʿAlí that it was Murád.

[2] زلفی دوشورر بر قیل ایله سنبلی بنده
لولویی قیلار خرده ایله دیشلری بنده

More interesting than any of those almost forgotten versifiers, not indeed on account of either the extent or the quality of his work, but because he is the first of a long series of royal poets, is Sultan Murád II.

Although certain members of the House of ʿOsmán, notably Prince Suleymán, had already shown an interest in poetry and in poets, none had, so far as we know, himself essayed the art. But from this time onwards it is the exception when a Sultan does not cultivate poetry. Of the twenty-eight sovereigns who have succeeded this Murád on the throne of ʿOsmán, seventeen have written verses, some at least of which are in our hands. Again, besides these eighteen poet-Sultans, a considerable number of Imperial Princes who never wore the crown have practised the art. Of course the work of those august rhymers differs greatly both in extent and in merit; in some cases we have a complete Díwán, in others but a line or two; while sometimes we encounter passages of great beauty or sublimity, and at others find only a tangle of insipid verbiage. But such inequality in no wise interferes with the fact that a very marked and altogether exceptional feeling for poetry is hereditary in the House of ʿOsmán, which House can show probably a greater number of cultivators of the art than any other royal line whether of ancient or modern times. [1]

[1] The following is the list of the poet-Sultans; when the writer made use

The life and achievements of Murád II belong to the history of the Ottoman Empire, not to that of Ottoman poetry. All that we need recall here is that he helped on the work of re-uniting the members of the West-Turkish family by the recovery of five of the seven little kingdoms annexed by Báyezíd and re-established by Timur, leaving only those of Qizil-Ahmedli and Qaraman to be gathered in by his successor.

We have already seen how vigorous became the growth of intellectual life in the time of this Sultan, and we have tried to find an explanation for the efflorescence in more than one direction. It may be that among the circumstances which helped to bring this about, the personal character of the Sovereign — always an important matter in the East — was not without influence. For this old King did what he could to foster learning and culture among his people. We read in Latífí and the others, that two days in each week Murád was accustomed to hold assemblies of poets and other persons distinguished in letters or science, when all manner of literary and scientific questions were debated. It was a frequent custom at such meetings to propound some question which those present would freely discuss, the Sultan himself usually joining in the debate, after which prizes and honorary titles were given to those who were judged to have acquitted themselves best. We are further told that

of a makhlas, this is placed within brackets after the name: Murád II; Mehemmed II (ᶜAvní); Báyezíd II (ᶜAdlí); Selím I (Selímí); Suleymán I (Muhibbí); Selím II (Selímí); Murád III (Murádí); Mehemmed III (ᶜAdlí); Ahmed I (Bakhtí); Mustafà I; ᶜOsmán II (Fárisí); Murád IV (Murádí); Mustafà II (Iqbálí); Ahmed III; Mahmúd I (Sabqatí); Mustafà III; Selím III (Ilhámí); Mahmúd II (ᶜAdlí). Verses by all of these royal authors are published in the fourth volume of ᶜAtá's History (Táríkh-i ᶜAṭá), Const. 1293 (1876). The complete Díwáns of Báyezíd II(?), Selím I and Suleymán I have been printed.

whenever Murád heard of any poor but deserving man of talent in his kingdom, he took care to find him some employment suited to his peculiar gift.

That Sultan Murád wrote much poetry is improbable; in any case very little of his work has reached us, the two following fragments — the first a couplet, the second a quatrain — being the only authentic specimens we have: — [1]

E'en although no right be mine to dare to crave one kiss of thee,
Yet whene'er the wise one knoweth, what of need for speech can be? [2]

Cupbearer, bring, bring here again my yestereven's wine;
My harp and rebeck bring and bid bespeak this heart o' mine.
What while I live, this mirth and this liesse beseem me well;
A day shall come when ne'er an one may e'en my dust divine. [3]

The late Professor Nájí [4] suggests that this quatrain may have been composed by the Sultan on returning to his quiet life at Maghnisa after the victory at Varna.

It would seem that the making of verses was not the only accomplishment of Sultan Murád; for the author of

[1] ᶜAtá gives a ghazel which he says is by this Sultan; but as he does not mention where he found it, and as it is unnoticed by the earlier writers, its genuineness is open to doubt.

[2] كرچه كيم حدّم دكلدر بوسه‌كى قيلمق ديلك
عارف اولان چون بيلور آنى نه لازم سويلمك
ساقى كتور كتور بنه دونكى شرابمى
سويلست دله كتور بنه چنك و ربابمى
بن وار ايكن كرك بكا بو ذوق و بو صفا
بر كون كله كه كورميه كيمسه ترابمى

[4] Professor (Muᶜallim) Nájí was a very distinguished modern poet and critic who wrote many valuable articles on the poets of the Old School. His name will be frequently mentioned in the course of this History. He died in Ramazán 1310 (1893).

the already-mentioned work on calligraphy and calligraphists[1] enters him among the Ottoman penmen who were distinguished by the excellence with which they wrote the suls and neskh hands.

Sultán Murád II succeeded in 824 (1421), and died in 855 (1451).

[1] Habíb Efendi, see p. 394, n. 1.

Up till now, as the reader may have observed, the school of Hajji Beyrám of Angora has contributed a greater number of poets than any other dervish community. Although the influence of its founder has been great, the Mevleví order, which afterwards became the chief centre of literary mysticism in Turkey, has so far yielded only one poet, Sultán Veled, in whose Rebáb-Náme we have the prelude to nearly all the mystic poetry that has followed. The traditions of the Mevleví dervish-order have always been literary, thanks no doubt in the first place to the genius of its illustrious founder, whose Mesneví has ever been held amongst the highest achievements of Persian poetry. Owing in great measure to the influence of this wonderful book and of the other poems of Jelál-ud-Dín, Persian became, if the expression may be allowed, the official language of the order; and consequently such poetry as the members wrote during the first few generations was almost wholly in that tongue. Thus the First Period can show hardly any Turkish verse due to Mevleví poets. In after times it became the fashion to write in Turkish; but even though the Mesneví itself was translated into that language, a good acquaintance with the Persian tongue was always held a necessary accomplishment for the serious Mevleví.

When Sultán Veled, the son of Mevláná Jelál-ud-Dín-i Rúmí, died in 712 (1312), he left four sons and two daughters, the names of the former being Chelebi Emír ʿArif,

ᶜAbid, Záhid and Wáhid. Three at least of his sons succeeded him in the generalship of the order, which afterwards fell to Emír ᶜAlim, the eldest son of Chelebi Emír ᶜArif who had died in 719 (1320). Emír ᶜAlim was followed by his son Emír ᶜAdil who held office for forty years.

The spiritual dynasty thus founded has lasted to the present day, and is therefore as old as the Imperial House. The Chelebi Efendi (such is the special title of the general of the Mevleví order) [1] who still holds his mystic court at Qonya is the lineal descendant of the author of the Mesneví. It would appear that once only was the chain broken; this was during the latter half of the sixteenth century, when for about eighteen years the generalship was either in abeyance or held by an outsider. Chelebi Ferrukh Efendi, who had succeeded his father Jenáb Chelebi Khusrev Efendi, had been deposed in consequence of the intrigues of certain evil-intentioned persons; but on his death in 1000 (1591-2), the succession was restored to the family of Jelál in the person of Ferrukh's son Chelebi Bústán Efendi.

Of the early Chelebi Efendis whose names have been mentioned, only Emír ᶜAdil seems to have written Turkish verses. From these, ᶜAlí Enver [2] quotes the following: —

[1] See p. 151, n. 3.

[2] Esrár Dede, himself a celebrated Mevleví poet, compiled a Tezkire or Biographical Dictionary of the poets of his order. Of this work, which was finished in 1211 (1796-7), I have so far been unable to procure a copy. An abridgment, however, was published in 1309 (1891-2) by ᶜAlí Enver Efendi, which presents the more important facts recorded in the complete work along with a selection from the verses therein quoted. ᶜAlí Enver prettily calls his *résumé* the Semáᶜ-kháne-i Edeb or 'Auditory of Culture,' the name Semáᶜ-kháne or 'Auditory' being given by the Mevlevís to the hall wherein they perform their rites, that being the place where they hear the voices of the Host of Heaven, and enter into ecstatic bliss. Von Hammer, who had a copy of Esrár's work, attributes it by a strange error to Sheykh Ghálib, an illustrious friend of the real author's, and a yet greater poet than he.

Yonder heart by tracery of earth unscored
Cometh keeper of the Mysteries to be;
Mirror-holder to the Tablet the Preserved,
Double grows it of the Script from doubt that 's free. [1]

There was another branch of the Mevláná's family which for a time was scarcely less illustrious than the line of the Chelebi Efendis. Mutahhara Khatun, one of Sultán Veled's two daughters, married Suleymán Sháh, a member of the royal house of Germiyan, [2] and from this union were born two sons, Khizr Pasha [3] and Ilyás Pasha.

Khizr, who died in 750 (1349-50), had a son called Bali who is famous in Mevleví annals under the surname of Sultán ʿAbá-púsh-i Velí or Prince Felt-clad the Saint, a title given to him because he was the first scion of the House of Germiyan to assume the distinctive Mevleví costume, which is made of felt. It is reported that Timur, who visited this

[1] لوح دل کم سادهٔ هر نقش اوله * حافظ اسرار غیب الغیب اولور
لوح محفوظه اولوب آیینه‌دار * عین ثانی نسخهٔ لا ریب اولور

The meaning is that the pure heart, free from worldly cares and desires, is able to receive impressions in the Spirit World (see pp. 56-9). Such a heart is here figured as holding a mirror before the Preserved Tablet (see p. 35) whereon all things, and notably the original of the Koran, are inscribed, and as becoming, through the reflection thus cast on it, the double of that Book in which is nothing doubtful. The Koran is so described because at the beginning of the second chapter occur the words: 'That (i. e. the Koran or its original) is the book! there is no doubt therein!' But here the Preserved Tablet symbolises the Eternal Verities.

[2] Who this Suleymán Sháh was, I have been unable to discover. The House of Germiyan was founded in 707 (1307-8), Veled died in 712 (1312); so Suleymán may have been a brother or son of Germiyan Bey the founder of the dynasty.

[3] According to the legend, Khizr Pasha received his name because on the day of his birth the Prophet Khizr appeared and, taking him out of his nurse's arms, carried him off into the Invisible World. A week afterwards he was discovered on the top of a mountain where he was being tended by a lioness, he having in the meantime attained the size and intelligence of a year-old child.

saint, confessed to his courtiers that he was filled with awe at the majesty of the mystic's presence. According to Enver, ᶜAbá-púsh died in 890 (1485), aged one hundred and twenty years. [1]

Ilyás Pasha, the second son of Mutahhara Khatun and Suleymán Sháh, had two sons, Jelál Arghun and Sháh Chelebi. The former, who died in 775 (1373-4), wrote (apparently in Turkish) a mesneví poem entitled Genj-Náme or 'The Book of the Treasure,' [2] from which Enver quotes this couplet: —

'Tis frenzied greed of gain that makes the world a land of ruins drear
'Tis Being and Not-being fills each mind on earth with awe and fear. [3]

The latter, Sháh Chelebi, who died in 780 (1378-9), does not appear to have written any Turkish poetry.

These princely mystics had each a son; Jelál Arghun's being named Burhán-ud-Dín; and Sháh Chelebi's, Sháh Mehemmed Chelebi. Both of these wrote Turkish verses. Burhán, who died in 798 (1395-6), is the author of the following ghazel: —

[1] There must be some confusion here. Khizr, the father of ᶜAbá-púsh, is said to have died in 750 (1349-50); if this date is correct, and if the latter was 120 years of age at the time of his death, this must have occurred in 870 (allowing him to be born the year his father died); if on the other hand he died in 890, he must have survived his father 140 years.

ᶜAbá-púsh had a son, as celebrated as himself, called Sultán Díwání. This mystic, who wrote Turkish verses under the pen-name of Semáᶜí, died in 936 (1529-30).

[2] The same title as Refiᶜí gave to his shorter poem. The 'Treasure' in these titles is an echo of the famous Hadís 'I was a hidden treasure, etc.'

[3] خراب آباد ایدن دهری انك سودای سودیدر
ویرن حیرت عقول عالمه بود و نبودیدر

Ghazel. [68]

Since my sad soul is come the Loved One's mirror bright to be,
O'er the directions six of earth I flash their radiancy. [1]

Though talismans an hundred guard the portal of desire,
With saintly favour's scimitar I cast it wide and free. [2]

Who looketh on me deemeth me a tenement of clay,
While I'm the ruin of the treasure-gems of Verity. [3]

To me is manifest that which is hidden to the world;
In sooth I'm e'en the orbit of the Eye of Certainty. [4]

No self-regarder may he be who my heart-secret shares;
For like the vocal flute my home within the veil doth be. [5]

Burhán established hath his claim, fulfilling each demand;
What though he say, 'I'm worthy heir of my high ancestry!' [6]

The other brother, Sháh Mehemmed Chelebi, was apparently fond of improvising. As an instance of his talent in this direction we are told that one day when he was seated by his father, two dervishes, one wise and one foolish, began

[1] For the Six Directions see p. 43, n. 3. Since the poet's soul is become the mirror in which the Beauty of the Beloved is reflected, it (his soul) has illumined all the earth.

[2] The word tevejjuh, here translated 'saintly favour,' has much the same sense as muráqaba, mentioned p. 180, n. 2, and means the spiritual assistance vouchsafed by a saint to a devotee or by a master to his disciple.

[3] For the connection between ruins and treasures see p. 361, n. 2.

[4] For the Eye of Certainty, the second degree of certain knowledge, see p. 328, n. 1. The poet here regards himself as the orbit or socket in which this Eye, this inward light, is situated.

[5] The flute is the sacred instrument of the Mevlevís: it does not regard itself through its eyes or holes: it lives concealed within the veil — the word perde, besides meaning 'veil,' means 'a musical note,' so the soul of the flute may be said to be expressed through the notes it gives forth.

[6] The claim to be a worthy descendant of Jelál by fulfilling the conditions of being a mystic and of being a poet.

to dispute in their presence, when the former somewhat discourteously addressed his opponent as 'Thou log!' whereupon the latter's anger flared up, and he turned complaining to the sheykh. Sháh Mehemmed immediately answered: —

Yonder evil heart up-flareth fiercely at the name of log,
Witness bearing that 'tis fuel meet to feed the Fire of Wrath![1]

نفس بد خو کاوله پر آتش اودون لفظندن
هیمهٔ نار غضب اولدیغنه شاهد در

Although the fame of Ahmedí and Sheykhí has eclipsed that of all rivals, those two great men were by no means the only romantic poets of the First Period. We have already seen that ʿĀshiq Chelebi mentions briefly and with scant ceremony an old writer called Ahmed who left a romantic poem, entitled Suheyl u Nev-Bahár or 'Canopus and Vere.' There are other old romancists to whom no biographer accords even a brief and unceremonious mention, authors of whose existence we should be wholly unaware were it not that their works happen to be in our hands. There must be others still — probably many others — whose writings either have been lost or have so far remained unnoticed, and of whom therefore we as yet know nothing.

A romancist concerning whom the biographers, though not altogether silent, yield only the most meagre information, is that Sheykh-oghli whom we met among the poets that gathered round Prince Suleymán at Adrianople, and who we learned was author of a poem which ʿĀshiq and Kátib Chelebi call the Ferrukh-Náme. [1] This Sheykh-oghli (or Sheykh-záde, as he is sometimes styled) is said by ʿĀlí to have borne the pen-name of Jemálí and to have been the sister's son of Sheykhí, and further to have been the writer of the epilogue to that poet's unfinished Khusrev and Shírín. ʿĀshiq, Hasan and Kátib Chelebi also say that the writer of this epilogue was named Jemálí, the two former making

[1] See p. 256.

him the sister's son, the last the brother of the deceased poet; but none of these three identifies this Jemálí with Sheykh-oghli the author of the Ferrukh-Náme. [1]

ʿAlí who alone among the biographers that I have been able to consult, [2] does more than mention Sheykh-oghli, tells us in addition to the facts just mentioned that this poet was originally in the service of the King of Germiyan, under whom he held the offices of nishánji [3] and defterdár. [4] This would fall in with the story of his relationship to Sheykhí who, it will be remembered, was a native of Germiyan where he spent his life. On the suppression of the Kingdom of Germiyan, Sheykh-oghli appears to have recognised Sultan Báyezíd as his sovereign; for it was to him, according to both ʿAlí and Kátib Chelebi, that he dedicated the poem which the latter entitles Ferrukh-Náme, but the former Khurshíd u Ferrukh-Shád. After the battle of Angora, when Báyezíd's son Suleymán set himself up as an independent ruler at Adrianople, Sheykh-oghli joined his circle, and this is the last we hear concerning him. ʿAlí says that he wrote, besides his romance, a number of qasídas, mostly of a homiletic description, that he was a diligent student of the Persian masters, and that he composed a 'parallel' to the R Qasída [5] of the great mystic poet Hakím Senáʾí. [6]

In the first volume of his History, under the entry Dschemalisade (Jemálí-záde), Von Hammer describes, from a manu-

[1] See p. 304.

[2] According to Von Hammer, his name appears in Sehí's Tezkire.

[3] The Nishánji was the officer at a Turkish court whose duty it was to inscribe the Tughra or Cipher of the Sovereign over all royal letters-patent. The office was practically equivalent to that of Chancellor.

[4] The Defterdár was the Treasurer at a Turkish court.

[5] See p. 101.

[6] Hakím Senáʾí is the earliest of the great Súfí poets; some authorities place his death as early as 535 (1140-1), others as late as 576 (1180-1). His greatest work is a mesneví entitled Hadíqa 'The Garden.'

script belonging to the Royal Library at Berlin, what is unquestionably the romance of Sheykh-oghli, the Ferrukh-Náme of ʿÁshiq and Kátib Chelebi, the Khurshíd u Ferrukh-Shád of ʿAlí. This manuscript, according to Von Hammer's account, which is the only notice of it that I have seen, was transcribed in 807 (1404-5). The date of composition is not mentioned; but the poet says that he began his work when Sháh Suleymán was King of all Germiyan; and he adds that this King had a son named Fakhshad. This Sháh Suleymán of Germiyan, who is perhaps identical with the Mír Sulmán to whom, according to Latífí, Ahmedí presented his Iskender-Náme, [1] seems to have died before the poem was finished, as the canto in which his name appears is immediately followed by one in honour of 'Báyezíd Bey the son of Orkhan.' The personage thus described was certainly of royal blood, says Von Hammer, who, however, imagines him to have been the King of Germiyan's Vezir. As a matter of fact we know from the statements of the Turkish authorities that the individual meant was none other than the Ottoman Sultan Báyezíd (the grandson of Orkhan), to whom, as they tell us, the work was presented. It is thus clear that Sheykh-oghli began his poem while Germiyan was still an independent kingdom, and finished it some time between the effacement of that state and the battle of Angora. [2]

The poem, according to Von Hammer's description of it, opens in the usual way with the praises of God, the Prophet, and the first four Khalífas; then comes the 'Reason of the Writing of the Book' in which the author asserts that he got his story from Arabic sources; [3] next we have the canto

[1] See p. 264.

[2] This disposes of Von Hammer's suggestion that the Berlin MS. (transcribed 807) may be the poet's autograph.

[3] The poem may have been translated directly from an Arabic version;

in which Sháh Suleymán's name occurs; and this in its turn is followed by that in praise of Báyezíd Bey the son of Orkhan, at the end of which the author mentions his own name as Sheykh-oghli, and prays the reader to overlook his shortcomings. In the epilogue he calls his book the Khurshíd-Náme, and says it was finished in the month of the First Rebí^{c}, but without specifying the year; and he again names himself Sheykh-oghli.[1] The Khurshíd-Náme or 'Book of Khurshíd' is thus the correct name of the poem which the historians variously entitle Ferrukh-Náme and Khurshíd u Ferrukh-Shád.

The story begins with the auspicious conjunction of the planets at the time of the royal marriage the fruit of which was the heroine, Princess Khurshíd. When this Princess grows up, the ladies of her father's household, who are hostile to her, seek to disparage her before her father; but she clears herself from every charge, and so pleases the King by her cleverness that he presents her with many gifts including a garden, wherein she builds a pavilion. One day when she and her governess are making an expedition into the country to visit the tomb of an unhappy lover, they encounter a band of young students among whom are Ferrukh-Shád the son of the King of the Sunset-land (Maghrib) and his companion Ázád. These two had set out to seek Khurshíd, of whose beauty they had heard, and on their way had fallen in with Khizr. Khurshíd and Ferrukh-Shád are brought

but judging from the proper names, which are all Persian (except Bogha Khan which is Turkish), the story appears to be of Persian orgin.

[1] The compiler of the famous fifteenth century Turkish story-book generally known as 'The History of the Forty Vezirs,' a translation of which I published in 1886, is represented in most MSS. of his work as speaking of himself under the same patronymic (in its Persian form) Sheykh-záde (i. e. Sheykh-son); but as in some copies we find his name given as Ahmed-i Misrí (i. e. Ahmed the Egyptian), it is unlikely that there was any connection between him and the poet of the Ferrukh-Náme.

together and are straightway enamoured of one another. Meanwhile Bogha Khan, the King of Cathay, sends an envoy to Siyáwush, the father of Khurshíd, asking her hand in marriage. This is refused, whereupon Bogha makes war upon Siyáwush, who would have been defeated but for the valour of Ferrukh-Shád and Khurshíd who penetrate into the Cathayan camp and slay Bogha Khan in single combat. Ferrukh-Shád and Ázád then go back to the Sunset-land to obtain the King's consent to the Prince's marriage with Khurshíd. This is refused and Ferrukh-Shád is thrown into prison. The King, however, soon dies, when his son succeeds him and is happily married to his beloved Khurshíd. [1]

Another old romancist, one this time of whom the biographers say absolutely nothing, is a certain Músa who used the makhlas of ᶜAbdí, and who wrote a romantic mesneví which he called the Jámesb-Náme or 'Book of Jámesb,' and dedicated to Sultan Murád II. In the epilogue to his poem, a manuscript of which is in the British Museum, [2] the author tells us that he finished his work in the spring of 833 (1430), having begun it in the same season of the preceding year, and that he wrote it in the town of Aydinjiq. At the close of the dedicatory canto the poet says that he translated the book in the Sultan's name, and that he called it the Jámesb-Náme. He does not tell us whence he made the translation or give any indication as to his sources. The poem is, however,

[1] Judging from the couplet quoted by ᶜAshiq and reproduced on p. 256 of the present volume, the metre of the Khurshíd-Náme is the hexametric remel, the same as that of Sheykhí's Khusrev and Shírín.

[2] Add. 24,962. In the notice of this volume in his Catalogue of the Turkish MSS. in the British Museum, Dr. Rieu says that in some MSS. (described in the catalogues of other collections) a poem bearing the same title and date, and evidently identical with the present, is ascribed to a writer called Saᶜdí. But, as he truly adds, the biographers are as silent concerning any Saᶜdí who flourished at this early time as they are concerning any ᶜAbdí or Músa.

nothing else than a versified rendering of the Arabian Nights story of The Queen of the Serpents, [1] the only noteworthy difference being in the preamble to the tale.

In the Turkish poem the scene is laid in Persia in the reign of Key-Khusrev (Cyrus). The Prophet Daniel [2] has in his possession a wonderful book describing the medicines against every ill even to death itself. This last consists in a concoction of certain herbs that grow on a mountain on the other side of the river Jeyhún (Oxus). Daniel determines to take advantage of this knowledge and so secure for himself eternal life. God, however, sends the angel Gabriel to frustate his plans. So as Daniel is crossing the narrow bridge over the Jeyhún in order to collect the herbs that grow on the farther side, he is confronted by Gabriel in the shape of a man. Daniel does not recognise him in human form, and so when the angel asks whether he knows of a man called Daniel in that country, the Prophet innocently answers that he himself is that man. Gabriel then says that he believes Daniel to have a wonderful book, and asks where it is; the Prophet answers that it is here, and draws it from his sleeve. The angel then asks whether he can tell him where Gabriel is; Daniel answers that he is in Heaven; Gabriel denies this; and after some altercation, Daniel asks to be allowed to consult his book; and while he is doing so, Gabriel knocks the volume out of his hand into the river, and disappears. This so vexes Daniel that he goes home, sickens and dies, notwithstanding that a few leaves of the precious book are recovered. These shortly before his death he puts into a

[1] This story is omitted by Galland and Lane; but it will be found in Mr. Payne's translation, vol. v, p. 52; and in Sir R. Burton's, vol. v, p. 298.

Daniel the Prophet, as we have already seen (p. 389, n. 1), is regarded in the East as the patron of the occult sciences and their practitioners. In the Arabian Nights the name of the sage is given as Daniel, but he is described as being a Grecian philosopher.

chest, bidding his wife give them to their son who is about to be born, when he shall ask for them. It is from this son Jámesb that the poem has its name. [1]

From this point the story as told by the Turkish poet differs only in unimportant details from the version in the Arabian Nights; and as this can be read in either of the complete translations of that collection, it is unnecessary to present it here otherwise than in merest outline.

Jámesb, who is a useless lazy youth, is left by some treacherous wood-cutters to perish at the bottom of a pit; but he finds an underground passage which leads him to a spacious cavern, in which are arranged thousands of stools. He falls asleep, and on awaking sees a serpent seated on each stool; for this is the palace of the King of the Serpents. [2] That sovereign, who has a beautiful human head but the body of a snake, makes Jámesb welcome. He will not, however, release him; and so to beguile his captivity, he tells him a long story which takes up the greater part of the book. This deals with the adventures of Bulqiyá, [1] a learned and pious Jew, who lived in the pre-Muhammedan ages, but who having heard of the future advent of Muhammed, conceives an ardent love for that Prophet, and sets out to

[1] The Prophet Daniel is said in the East to have had a son called Jámásb or Jámesb. This name is ancient Persian, and was borne by the minister of King Gushtásb, one of the heroes of the Sháh-Náme. In most recensions of the Arabian Nights the son of the Grecian sage receives the Arab name of Hásib Kerím-ud-Dín; but in the text used by Von Hammer the original Persian Jamasb was retained. In the Arabic characters, Jámesb جامسب does not differ much from Hásib حاسب, and the one might easily be replaced by the other.

[2] In the Arabian Nights the snake-monarch is called Meliket-ul-Hayyát, i. e. 'the Queen of the Serpents,' and in our poem, Sháh-i Márán, i. e. 'the Sháh of the Serpents.' The title Sháh may be equivalent to either 'King' or 'Queen,' but as the former is more usual, and as there is nothing in the poem to suggest the latter, I have preferred to translate by 'King.'

[3] In the Arabian Nights this name is Bulúqiyá.

seek what he may learn about him. The course of his wanderings leads him into the unknown regions that lie outside the Habitable Quarter of the earth [1] away among the isles of the Circling Oceans and the Mountains of Qáf. [2] On one of those islands he discovers a young man weeping beside two stately tombs. They tell one another their respective histories, and that told by the stranger, who is Prince Jihán-Sháh, [3] son of the King of Kábul, occupies almost the whole of what remains of the poem. This Prince having lost his way when hunting, wanders beyond the confines of the known world, where he meets with a series of extraordinary adventures, and at length finds himself in some unknown land in a city peopled wholly by Jews. He consents to assist one of these to collect certain precious stones that are found on the top of an inaccessible mountain, and so is sewn up in the belly of a slaughtered mule, seized upon by an eagle, and borne up to the highest peak. On the bird's alighting, Jihán-Sháh comes out from his hiding-place, which so scares the eagle that it flies away. He then throws down many of the stones to the Jew, who thereafter refuses to show him the way of descent, and goes off, leaving him to perish. But he pushes on for a time, and finally comes to a splendid palace where he meets a kind old man named Sheykh Nasr the King of the Birds, who gives him liberty to go where he will about the palace and the gardens, only forbidding him to open a certain door. The denial of this door whets Jihán-Sháh's curiosity, so one day when Sheykh Nasr is occupied with his birds, he opens it and finds himself in a lovely garden in the midst of which is a lake with a fair pavilion on one side. He enters this, and after a while three white birds like doves, but as large as eagles, alight

[1] See p. 47, n. 1. [2] See p. 38.

[3] In the Arabian Nights this name is Ján-Sháh.

on the edge of the lake. These throw off their feathers and become three lovely maidens who straightway enter the water where they play and swim about. When they come out, the Prince goes up and salutes them, and falls violently in love with the youngest; but they don their feather-vests and fly off. On Sheykh Nasr's return, Jihán-Sháh tells him what has happened, and the Sheykh upbraids him with having through his disobedience brought about his own undoing. He tells him that the maidens are daughters of the Jinn and that they come there once a year from he knows not where; and he adds that as the Prince is so enamoured of the youngest, he must wait till they return next year, and then, when they are in the water, must possess himself of his beloved's feather-vest, as without that she cannot fly away, and thus she will remain in his power. Jihán-Sháh does this, and in this way becomes possessed of the maiden whose name is Shemse. They return together to Kábul; but one day Shemse dons her feather-vest, and crying to Jihán-Sháh to come to her at the Castle of Jewels, flies off. With the greatest difficulty and after many marvellous adventures, Jihán-Sháh finds his way to the Castle of Jewels, which is the palace of Shemse's father and lies in an unknown country of the Jinn beyond Mount Qáf. He is well received, and he and Shemse agree to divide their time between the courts of their respective parents. This goes on for some years, till on one of their journeys, when the Princess is bathing in a river she is killed by a shark, which so distresses Jihán-Sháh that he determines never to leave that spot so long as he lives. He therefore builds there two tombs, in one of which he buries Shemse, while the other is destined for himself; and it is there that Bulqiyá finds him. Bulqiyá then continues his journey till he falls in with Khizr at whose bidding he closes his eyes, on opening which he finds himself back in his home

in Egypt. The King of the Serpents had refused to allow Jámesb to leave, because he foresaw that in letting him go he would be sealing his own doom. But at length he gives him permission, only praying him not to enter the public bath. For seven years after his return to the surface of earth, Jámesb never goes into the bath; but at last he is forced in with the result that he is recognised and compelled to disclose the dwelling-place of the King of the Serpents, whose flesh, it has been discovered by the Vezir who is a magician, is the only cure for a terrible illness from which King Cyrus is suffering. The King of the Serpents, who knows what will happen, tells Jámesb that the Vezir will set him to watch the pot in which the flesh is being cooked, and will bid him drink the scum that rises first and preserve for him that which rises second; but that in reality he must do exactly the reverse. All this happens, and when Jámesb drinks the second scum he sees, on raising his eyes to the sky, the circling of the spheres and all the marvels of the celestial phenomena, and, on lowering them to earth, he perceives all the secrets of plants and minerals and terrestrial substances, and so becomes perfect in all science. But when the Vezir drinks the first scum, which he believes to be the second, he straightway falls down dead. The King recovers, and Jámesb by reason of his great knowledge is made Vezir; and on asking for his father's legacy, he receives from his mother the few leaves of the wonderful book that were recovered from the river.

The poem, which is in the metre of ʿAshiq's Gharíb-Náme and the other early mesnevís, makes no pretension to being a work of art. It is written in the simplest possible style, simpler even than that of Ahmedí's Iskender-Náme. In striking contrast to the contemporary poem of Sheykhí, there is here not the slightest attempt at literary embellishment.

The aim of the writer has simply been to turn the long romance into plain Turkish rhyme. But the work is interesting through its language; very few Arabic or Persian words are employed, while on the other hand we get many old Turkish words and forms that have long ago become obsolete. There are several ghazels scattered through the poem, as in the Khusrev and Shírín of Sheykhí.

The following passage describes how Prince Jihán-Sháh got possession of his bride. The time has come when the three sisters are due on their yearly visit to the palace, and the Prince has just been praying that success may be in store for him. It is hardly necessary to say that these 'daughters of the Jinn' are identical with the 'swan-maidens' of European folk-lore and that the method of their capture is the same in the West as in the East.

From the Jámesb-Náme. [69]

When he thus had prayed, he did his head upraise;
E'en that moment, as around he cast his gaze,
He beheld the three who thither winged their flight,
And he hid in the pavilion there forthright.
Then on the estrade again they lighted fair,
And they doffed their raimenture and stript them bare.
'Come and let us the pavilion search,' said one,
'Let us see that hidden therewithin be none.'
Quoth another, 'Ne'er a creature cometh here;
'None is hither come, so cast aside thy fear.'
Then the youngest, 'E'en if one there hidden lay,
'On what fashion would he deal by us, I pray?
'Which of all of us three would he seek to win? —
'(Just supposing that a man were hid therein.)
'Both of you he'd leave, and he would seize on me,
'Hug me to his breast and kiss me merrily!'
When they heard these words they laughed together gay,
And they rose and plunged within the lake straightway.
* * * * * * * * * * *

Swam and dived they in the water joyously,
Playing each with other full of mirth and glee,
When the Prince from the pavilion darting, flew,
Snatched the maiden's vest, and stood there full in view.
When they looked and saw the Prince a-standing there,
Forth from out the water straightway sprang the pair,[1]
Snatched their vests, and fast and swift away they fled,
Gained a place, did on their clothes, and off they sped.
She whose little vest was snatched, she could not fly;
Off the others went, nor turned on her an eye.
All alone she bode within the water there,
And began to pray the Prince with many a prayer:
'Give my vest, and I'll do all thou biddest me;
'Go I shall not, nay, I will abide with thee.
'Keep my clothes, but hither fling my vest, I pray;
'And, till I come out, withdraw a little way.
'I am thine; I swear to thee I shall not fly,
'Never shall I leave thee till the day I die.'
Prince Jihán-Sháh, answering, said, 'O Soul of me,
'Thou hast melted this my body wondrously.
'Full a year it is I pine for thee alway,
'Scanning all the roads around, by night, by day.
'Lo now God hath sent thee, granting thee to me;
'(Every day to Him may lauds a thousand be!)
'God Most High hath granted me my need to gain;
'He hath made thy vest the balm to heal my pain.
'Now my master,[2] who hath tutored me with care,
'Spake on this wise: "Give not up her vest, beware!"
'Never shall I give it, having won my prize;
'Nay, I rush not mid the fire with open eyes!'

In a Turkish chrestomathy compiled by Moriz Wickerhauser, and published in Vienna in 1853,[3] occur three short extracts from an old Turkish metrical version of another

[1] i. e. the two elder sisters.

[2] i. e. Sheykh Nasr.

[3] 'Wegweiser zum Verständniss der Türkischen Sprache,' von Moriz Wickerhauser, Wien, 1853.

Arabian Nights story, namely that of Seyf-ul-Mulk and Bedí'-ul-Jemál.[1] The compiler says not a word as to whence he obtained these extracts. He writes over the first: 'Taken from Ibn-Yúsuf's Story of Seyf-ul-Mulk;' and that is all the information he vouchsafes. It is possible that he did not know who Ibn-Yúsuf was (I can find no trace of any poet so named); but he ought to have said something concerning the manuscript from which he made his selections. The three extracts given are sufficient to show that the story is practically the same as the Arabian Nights romance; but of course they do not enable us to say whether the versions are identical or differ in detail. They are also sufficient to show that the poem is in very old Turkish, and therefore probably a work of the First Period or, at the latest, of the opening years of the Second.

It will have been noticed that the three romances we have just looked at are all, so far as we can judge, simply stories, and nothing else. The tale does not appear in their case to be presented as an allegory, or to be made the vehicle for conveying instruction whether mystic or philosophic. And this perhaps accounts in a measure for the neglect with which they met. For although the illiterate Oriental dearly loves a wonder-tale, the learned ignore, or at least used to ignore, as altogether unworthy of their notice, as fit only to amuse the vulgar crowd, any mere story which held no lesson beneath its surface-meaning. Erudite scholars who prided themselves on their learning, as did our historians and biographers, disdained to notice such childish trivialities or the men who played with them. Thus Kátib Chelebi in his huge bibliographic dictionary, where he gives a succint account of all

[1] See Lane, vol. iii, p. 308: Payne, vol. vii, p. 55: Burton, vol. vii, p. 314. In the Arabian Nights the name of the hero is Seyf-ul-Mulúk.

the important works in Arabic, Persian and Turkish, known in his day, dismisses the Thousand and One Nights, in Europe the most popular and most widely known of Muhammedan writings, with the mere mention of its name, without a single word of comment.

Again, as manuscripts were transcribed, not for the illiterate, but for the learned, naturally but few copies would be made of such books as the latter (practically the only readers of those days) reckoned unworthy of attention. This no doubt is the explanation of the extreme rarity of such books nowadays; and in all probability this same neglect, born of learned arrogance, has led to the total disappearance of many an old romance.

CHAPTER X.

Concluding Remarks.

The Position at the Close of the First Period. Eastern and Western Culture in the Middle Ages.

By the close of the First Period it was definitively determined which of the West-Turkish dialects was to be the literary idiom of the future, and what was to be the nature of the poetry that should be composed therein.

We have many times observed that the poets, whatever the style in which they wrote, have up till now made use of the dialectic forms peculiar to the province to which they happened to belong. There has been no common centre for the West-Turkish world; on the contrary, the capital of each little state has been a separate and independent centre of culture as well as of government. So long as such conditions lasted there was no reason why a poet should cultivate any other dialect than that of his own province. And hence has come that provincialism, that heterogeneity of dialect, which has led us to describe the poetry of this Period as West-Turkish rather than as Ottoman. While the Ottoman was but one out of several Turkish states there had been no reason why a non-Ottoman poet should make use of the Ottoman dialect rather than of his own. But now, when the political predominance of the Ottoman State has been established,

and all the others either have been or are about to be merged in it, the dialect of the Ottoman naturally becomes the official language of the West-Turkish Empire, and is therefore accepted as the standard form by the entire community. It consequently results that poets who, had they lived somewhat earlier, would have written in the Turkish of Germiyan or Qastamuni, now discard whatever is local in such dialects, and assimilate their idiom to that of the Ottoman capital, henceforward the common metropolis. And so for the first time there comes to be a uniformity in the language of this literature, and West-Turkish passes into Ottoman poetry.

The nature of the Ottoman poetry into which the West-Turkish thus now develops has likewise been determined. This, it has been settled, is to be Persian; it is also to be artificial, exclusive, unpopular.

From the very beginning West-Turkish poetry had shaped its course by that of Persia, which had stood to it as foster-mother; but it had not always been artificial, exclusive, unpopular. The first intention of this poetry was purely didactic; the aim of the earliest poets was to teach spiritual truth to their fellow-countrymen. They naturally chose the easiest and most direct way to accomplish this; and so they wrote in the vernacular, the common speech of daily life, which every one could understand, throwing their words into simple rhyming lines that could easily be retained in the memory.

For over a century this continued to be the rule; practically all serious literary poetry was composed in the mesnevi form, and written in plain, straightforward Turkish, not very far removed from the spoken idiom, and perfectly intelligible even to the unlearned. During the fourteenth century and the opening years of the fifteenth, when a man wanted to play with poetry, or to treat poetry primarily as an art, looking more to the style than to the matter, to

the manner of expression than to the thing expressed, he avoided mesneví, and confined himself to the lyric forms. As the models of such writers were necessarily the artificial lyrics of Persia, there speedily developed among the West-Turkish lyric poets an artificial and unnatural idiom, at least three-fourths Persian, and therefore incomprehensible to those unacquainted with that tongue, and in marked contrast to the language of the contemporary mesneví.

But this artificial idiom bears what the blunt Turkish of the mesneví-writers does not, the stamp of culture. Through its inherent beauty and the deftness of craftsmanship for which it gives opportunity, it has always exercised a peculiar charm over artistic and sympathetic minds brought within its influence; and so when Sheykhí, writing under the immediate inspiration of Nizámí, introduced it into mesneví likewise, the fate of the old homely Turkish was sealed. Till this poet wrote his Khusrev and Shírín the distinction of style between mesneví and lyric poetry had been strictly maintained; we have only to recollect how Ahmedí, Sheykhí's immediate predecessor, employs in his mesneví, the Iskender-Náme, a style so simple that it often degenerates into baldness, while in his lyrics his language is to the full as artificial as that of any poet of the First Period. But after Sheykhí wrote, the distinction disappears; subsequent poets, writers of mesneví as much as writers of lyrics, fascinated by the brilliance of the artificial idiom, seek to try their strength therein, disdaining the common speech as beneath the dignity of art; and so in the Ottoman poetry into which the West-Turkish now passes, we find that the divorce is everywhere complete between the idiom in which it finds expression and the language as spoken among the people.

Sheykhí and the lyric writers have not only determined what is to be the form and fashion of Ottoman poetry; they

have struck what is to be the key-note of its strain. The first poets were frankly teachers; they delivered their message in such a way that no one could doubt their meaning; their words present no tangle of Divine and human love. But Sheykhí and the lyric writers speak in metaphors; they are always hovering on the border-line between the sensual and the spiritual; their ostensible subject is human love, but through and beyond this, giving to it what it has of life and beauty, is ever felt to be the Celestial Glory, the Ecstasy of the Divine. And so in the Ottoman poetry now about to be, while we shall find that the artlessness and candour of the early poets has passed away with their simple homely speech, we shall recognise a Sheykhí in every romancist, an Ahmedí in every lyric.

In concluding our review of the First Period of West-Turkish poetry, I would very briefly draw the reader's attention to an aspect of the subject which he has most probably himself more than once observed, but concerning which I have so far said nothing, namely, the close similarity that exists between the intellectual and moral culture which I have endeavoured to describe and that which prevailed during the same centuries in Western Europe.

In the fields of philosophy and science there is not merely similarity, there is identity. And in those directions where there is not identity, there is a very remarkable analogy. The civilisation of the Muhammedan East is based upon the Arabic Koran, that of medieval Europe upon the Latin Bible. The Eastern poets had the monopoly in the histories and legends they inherited from the ancient Persians, the Western in those they learned from the Roman classics. These are the two chief sources of such difference as exists, and the analogy in both cases is complete.

The first is the more important of the two; but even here, as the points of agreement between Bible and Koran are greater and more numerous than the points of variance, the divergence in culture that hence resulted was superficial rather than essential.[1] For the rest, the religion of 'the men of heart' was the same in East and West. Change a few names and phrases borrowed directly from the prevailing positive religion, and it would be hard to distinguish between the effusions of the dervish mystic and those of the ecstatic monk or nun.

The identity in philosophy and science (which latter was but a branch of philosophy) results from the fact that not only were the original sources the same for both East and West, but that a great number of the European treatises on these subjects were translated from or inspired by the works of Muhammedans or of Jews who wrote for the most part in the Arabic language. For Arabic was to the world of Islam what Latin was to Western Christendom. The language of Holy Writ, a knowledge of it was the first necessity for the Muslim, whatever might be his nationality, who aspired to become a man of learning. Arabic thus became the common language of all the learned throughout the Muhammedan world, and so it came to be the language of learning, and in it were composed all works dealing with any serious subject, whether religious, philosophic or scientific. In all this it is paralleled by the course of the Latin language in the West. And as in the West the French tongue gradually asserted itself and became a medium of literature, so

[1] What most sharply distinguished the West from the East was not the difference between Bible and Koran, but the elaborate ritual which the Papal church superimposed upon a simple Eastern religion, and the extravagant pretensions advanced by the Romish priesthood, from any analogy to which Islam has happily been ever free. These matters, however, affected social life rather than intellectual culture.

in the East did the Persian after a time assert itself and develop into a literary speech; and as the rise of French literature was in due course followed by that of English, so was the development of Persian literature by the appearance of Turkish.

In conditions so similar, culture and civilisation naturally developed along parallel lines. And so we find the poetry of the medieval West to be inspired by the same ideals as that of the medieval East. Notably is this the case with the poetry of Provence; instant in the quest of subtleties of fancy and curiosities of language, ever flitting between the earthly and the Heavenly love, the Troubadours and those who learned from them in Italy and France were moved by a spirit in no wise different from that which spoke through the Persian and Turkish lyric poets. Likewise, the romancists of the West, allegorising through thousands of rhyming couplets, are the faithful representatives of those Eastern writers of whom Nizámí and Sheykhí may stand as types.

Were it not beside our purpose, it would be easy to trace this similarity in detail, and interesting to inquire how far the West is here the debtor of the East. However the question just suggested might be answered, one point is certain, namely, that from whatever source medieval Europe received these matters she held in common with the East, she did not learn them from her Roman teachers.

All that concerns us in our present studies is that this parallelism in culture between East and West continued all through the fourteenth and through the greater part of the fifteenth century. It was not interrupted till the Renaissance diverted the whole current of intellectual and moral life in Europe. But the separation which then ensued was complete as it was sudden. Under the guidance of the new-found Hellenism, the West turned aside from the old road, and

pursued a way which led in a new and very different direction. The East continued to follow the old path; and so by the sixteenth century, they who had for long been fellow-travellers along the same road, were to one another as aliens and barbarians. Up till then, though they had met most often as foemen, they had understood one another; but when Europe broke away, the mutual understanding ceased. The genius of the Middle Age and the genius of the Renaissance are so opposite that mutual comprehension seems impossible. In the West the latter killed the former; but into the East it could not pass. And so to this day the typical European and the typical Oriental never truly understand one another; for in the East, at least in the unsophisticated East, it is still the Middle Age.

END OF VOL. I.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

First lines of the Turkish Text of the Poems translated in Volume I.

[1] اکر کیدور قرنداش یوقسا یاروز

[2] دانی که من ز عالم یالغوز سینی سیورمین

[3] مولانا در اولیا قطبی بلك

[4] سنون اوك بو کیجه نور دوقتی

[5] تنکری ایچون کل بکا کیم آنکاسین تانکری‌یی

[6] کعبه و پوت ایمان بنم چرخ اوروبن دونن بنم

[7] اول قادر کن فیکون لطف ایدیجی رحمان بنم

[8] یولداش اولهٔم ایکیمز کل دوسته کیدهٔم کل

[9] یا الهی کر سؤال ایتسك بکا

[10] کور کم اول الله نلر قلمش درر

[11] بر عجب حکمت دیایم نظمله

[12] ای کوکل سن یول اریله یارسك

[13] تنك شکری لعل لبوك تنکه کتوردی

[14] ای سیه کیسو و سپید ذقن

[۱۵] بن نجاسی دیریلم سندن اراخ
[۱۶] یار بیزومیله ینا کور که نه آل ایلدی
[۱۷] اولمش تنومه عشقی انوك روح دکلمی
[۱۸] نکارینا نکارینا نکارین
[۱۹] دیدم لبوکی صورسم و امسم اولامی
[۲۰] شاد اولورسم وصلوکله غم اولامی
[۲۱] کوکلم ینه اول لیلیه مجنون اولمش
[۲۲] دیدم که لبك دیدی نه شیرین سوبلر
[۲۳] دیدی که نچون کوزوکی پر نم کرورم
[۲۴] بن لبلروکی جانومه ام سم کرورم
[۲۵] یورك کوزکوك یولنه صد پاره کرك
[۲۶] جانانیه جان ویرمکه عشّاقه صلادر
[۲۷] ازلدا حق نا یازمیشیسا بولور
[۲۸] حقا شکر قوچلروك دورانی در
[۲۹] بخشی اکلادم جهاندا وایه یوخ
[۳۰] سنجلایین دنیاده خوب ازمش
[۳۱] کوکلدا کزلو بولسا بر تاسه در
[۳۲] بلّودر حق قاننداکردارمز
[۳۳] کورمدم سن تك لطیف نازك جوان
[۳۴] صحبت اتدوك بو کیجا شول یارلا
[۳۵] همیشه عاشق کوکلی بریان بولر
[۳۶] الله ادن ذکر ایدالم اوّلا
[۳۷] آمنه خاتون محمّد انه‌سی
[۳۸] الوداع ای جان جانان الوداع
[۳۹] ایا خورشید مه پیکر جمالك مشتری منظر

[۴۰] اکی طاغا اغردی اول یولده شاه
[۴۱] کرم اندن داخی سورب شهریار
[۴۲] اول ارادًا چونکه کتدی شهریار
[۴۳] ایلت بنم سلامم دلداره ای صبا
[۴۴] هر کم کزوکه صید اوله مست و خراب الور
[۴۵] نه یوزوکوك نظیری مهر و مه وار
[۴۶] اولکه یوزوك کلُ زلفوك ریحان ایلمش
[۴۷] نه مظهر سن که اولدی سرتسر نور
[۴۸] میرُو سُلَمان عزّ نصره جون اجر جام شراب
[۴۹] کل ای دل مطلب اعلی ارسك
[۵۰] مکر قوندوغی یر پرویز شاهك
[۵۱] مکر بر کون شه فرخنده اختر
[۵۲] پس اول کرکسلین کوك کوزلو قاری •
[۵۳] شیرین حدیثك هر بری بر کوهر یکدانه در
[۵۴] عبد اکبر در جمالك عبده جان قربان اولور
[۵۵] ای یوزك نصر من الله ای صاچك فتح قریب
[۵۶] اول تمام آیك یوزندن چونکه رفع اولدی نقاب
[۵۷] دائم انا لحق سویلرم حقدن چو منصور اولمشم
[۵۸] ای یوزك عشقنده سر کردان فلك
[۵۹] ای حقی هر یرده ایسترسن که وار
[۶۰] کلمشم حقدن انا لحق سویلرم
[۶۱] دالمشم شول بحره کیم پایانی یوخ
[۶۲] بی وفا دنیادن اوصاندی کوکل
[۶۳] کل محیط عشقه بر کز داله کور
[۶۴] کورمشم هر شیده حق مطلقی

[۹۵] حق تعالی آدم اوغلی اوزی در

[۹۶] له الملك له الحمد له الشكر له النعما

[۹۷] بو خان ایچره نیچه خان قوندی کوچدی

[۹۸] آیینهٔ جانان اولمق جان حزینم

[۹۹] بو مناجاتی قیلب قلدردی باش

Digitized with financial assistance from
Ms.Vaidehi Thakar
on 06 November, 2019